44

A LETTER

TO

THE BISHOP OF EXETER;

CONTAINING

AN EXAMINATION OF HIS LETTER

TO THE

Archbishop of Canterbury.

FROM

WILLIAM GOODE, M.A., F.S.A.

RECTOR OF ALLHALLOWS THE GREAT AND LESS, LONDON.

FOURTH EDITION.

LONDON:

J. HATCHARD AND SON, 187, PICCADILLY.

1850.

A LETTER

TO

THE BISHOP OF EXETER.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY C. F. HODGSON, 1, GOUGH SQUARE, FLEET STREET.

A LETTER

TO

THE BISHOP OF EXETER;

CONTAINING

AN EXAMINATION OF HIS LETTER

TO THE

Archbishop of Canterbury.

FROM

WILLIAM GOODE, M.A., F.S.A.

RECTOR OF ALLHALLOWS THE GREAT AND LESS, LONDON.

FOURTH EDITION.

LONDON:

J. HATCHARD AND SON, 187, PICCADILLY.

1850.

A LETTER,

&c. &c.

MY LORD,—

You will not be surprised, that I should feel myself called upon to take some notice of your recent Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury. The frequent references occurring in it to my statements on the controversy to which it relates, and the nature of the observations made upon them, are such as to require from me an answer. I must be permitted to add, that the attack which your Lordship has there made upon our common ecclesiastical Ruler and Primate (to say nothing of your censure of other and still higher authorities), would alone justify any of the faithful sons of our Church in placing before the public a calm review of your statements.

My Lord, in making this attack, you are conscious that you are assailing one whose position entirely prevents the possibility of his offering any reply, and to whose Christian forbearance alone you are indebted for being allowed to disturb the peace of the Church with impunity. Your Lordship, with characteristic ingenuity, has taken advantage of a phrase in his Grace's Preface to his new edition of his work on Apostolical Preaching, to represent him as having descended from his high position into the field of controversy, on a subject in which you are one of the parties. And, with your usual accuracy, you have stated, that, "in the whole history of the Church of England," you are "not aware that anything of a similar kind has ever before occurred." Have you never heard, then, my Lord, of Archbishop Cranmer's Answer to Bishop Gardiner? Are you really so little versed in the writings of our Reformers, that such a work as this comes not even within

the limits of your recollection? And, were your statement correct, could you have placed before the world a fact more self-condemnatory? If the unparalleled character of your proceedings had forced His Grace a step out of the usual course, I leave it to your Lordship's consideration, in what position it would have left your own cause.

But, my Lord, it is not so. His Grace has done no such thing; and time will show, whether he has any intention of so doing. The charge is, like too many of your Lordship's accusations, groundless, unjustifiable, and offensive. Your Lordship does not need to be informed, but the public may, that in the course of the recent controversy, and when it was known that His Grace would have to sit in judgment upon the Cause then *sub judice*, certain parties, on your Lordship's side of the question, felt it to be consistent with Christian candour, to cull certain passages from his work on Apostolical Preaching (first published thirty-five years ago),—separating them from modifying passages, of 33 years standing, in the context,—and, in the face of these modifying passages, and also of distinct declarations made upon the subject in the course of the last few years, give them to the world as His Grace's sentiments upon the Cause then *sub judice* in the Church. My Lord, those who are defending the cause of truth can afford to leave such practices to the fate which, sooner or later, inevitably awaits them, and therefore your supporters were permitted to enjoy undisturbed all the aid which such a system of defence could afford them. They were left unnoticed; and if anything was wanting to show their true character, it has been supplied by the quotations now put forward by your Lordship's own hands, as proving that His Grace's sentiments were entirely opposed to what they were thus represented to be. My Lord, under these circumstances, was there any cause for surprise, was there any just ground for charging His Grace with descending into the field of "controversy," when in the Preface to a new edition of his work, published after the Judgment had been delivered, he pointed attention, *in an uncontroversial way*, to the fact that there were various passages in the very work which had been so misused, bearing out the Sentence to which he had just

given his public sanction. Most justly did he "call attention to what" he had "written concerning the grace of baptism." And he added, that his mind was confirmed in the correctness of such a view of the matter by other arguments and testimonies which he there adduces. And I believe, that, with the exception of a small and turbulent faction, the Church will thankfully accept such an exposition of His Grace's views, without dreaming of his having "descended" (as your Lordship justly expresses it) into the field of "controversy" with you on the subject.

My Lord, I need scarcely observe, that in the remarks I am about to make on your Letter, I speak merely as an individual. I alone am responsible for the statements here made. And my remarks are made on a copy of your Lordship's Letter, bearing on the cover the impress of the "*fourth* edition," delivered at my house before three o'clock on *the same day on which it was first published.* I call your Lordship's attention to this fact, in order that you may give such directions on the subject as you think fit to your respectable publisher, who does not usually, I believe, adopt such practices.

My Lord, the first five-and-twenty pages of your Letter are spent in the attempt to prove, that his Grace's sentiments have recently undergone a great change on the subject of the effects of Baptism. And you intimate at its conclusion, that though you have been his Grace's "affectionate friend for nearly thirty years," such change has compelled you to become "now" only his "afflicted servant." My Lord, if your charge were true, would there be any cause for wonder or reproach, if, in his later years, His Grace had thought good somewhat to modify the statements made by him in a work published more than thirty years ago? Would it justify a *virulent attack* upon one under whose authority you are placed, and to whom you have solemnly pledged yourself that you will pay all "due reverence and obedience?" What would have been your Lordship's feelings, if a presbyter of your diocese had adopted the same course towards yourself, with respect to certain works published within a very short period of time from one another? But your Lordship may perhaps say, that you claim ample scope for

change, "excepting only one single subject, the fundamental articles of the Creed." "The efficacy of baptism," you add, "is such an article." And is it really a "fundamental article" of the Christian creed, that every infant is necessarily a partaker of spiritual regeneration in and by baptism? Where is your Lordship's authority for such a statement, either in Holy Scripture or in the ancient Creeds of the Church? I am quite aware of the citations made from both sources by heated controversialists, who find their own preconceived notions in every passage that relates to the subject, but I challenge your Lordship to produce a single passage from either that will bear you out in this assertion. Is it really a desertion of a fundamental article of faith, to admit, that all the effects which were at one time supposed to attend the administration of infant Baptism do not invariably and necessarily attend it?

Permit me, my Lord, to remark, that fundamental articles of faith are not to be created by the *dictum* of any man, or body of men. They must rest, as the Creeds themselves are made by our Church to rest, on "most sure warrants of Holy Scripture." And such sure warrants, or any warrant, for the invariable spiritual regeneration of all infants in and by Baptism, your Lordship will certainly look for in vain.

But, my Lord, the truth is, that you have, unconsciously, most incontrovertibly established the fact, (as I shall immediately show) that, *according to your own view of the matter*, there has been, for even more than this period of "affectionate friendship," *no change at all.* You tell us, that the "additions and omissions" made in the 9th edition, just published, of his Grace's work on "Apostolical preaching," make its "tone" on the subject of Baptism "very different from that which it exhibited" in the original work published in 1815. And you courteously remark, that while his Grace, in his Preface, "speaks of it as if it were still substantially the same," it will be your "painful duty to remark on some most important changes," &c. And your accusation is, that this change is *recent.* You regret that "now," in his "advanced years and exalted station," he should "almost contradict the sounder teaching of his earlier years." (p. 5.) Now, my Lord, would

it not be reasonable to claim from any one coming forward publicly to make such a charge against his Primate and former "friend," that he should first have ascertained its truth? Is it too much to expect from your Lordship, that when you utter the most confident statements, and make them the ground-work of charges of change, and insinuations of falsehood, against your ecclesiastical superior, you should have made some inquiry into the grounds upon which such charges rest? Or are we really to conclude, that your most solemn asseverations may be uttered in a state of *complete and conscious* ignorance, whether they are true or false? Your Lordship, it seems, possesses the first edition of the Archbishop's work, published in 1815, and having procured a copy, or the loan of a copy, of the *ninth* edition, published in 1850, you straightway publish a "Letter" in which you compare the two editions, and then tell the world of the "additions and omissions" made "*in this new edition;*" and imply that they were made to meet the circumstances of the case of Mr. Gorham. Such is the foundation upon which your Lordship almost wholly rests your charge against His Grace for contradicting in his later years the teaching of his earlier!

Now, my Lord, what is the fact? Every one of the passages (with the exception of a note which, you yourself think, admits of a sense to which you do not object) which you have quoted as "new matter" in this "new edition," occur in every edition of the work from the second (inclusive) published thirty-three years ago—that is, in 1817; and therefore, apparently,* before the "affectionate friendship" commenced. And the *note* certainly dates as far back as the edition of 1832; and therefore has co-existed apparently during at least eighteen years of such "friendship."

The "new matter" in which your Lordship finds so much *unhappy obscuration, if not absolute contradiction,* of the sound views of His Grace, when your "affectionate friendship" of nearly thirty years commenced, and in which you find "*more than one startling intimation*" of His Grace's "*altered* view," is just thirty-three years old, and has been seven times before

* I say *apparently*, because the precise dates of the rise and termination of this "affectionate friendship" might afford matter for controversy.

brought before the world in as many distinct editions of the work—editions not published in the same day, but in different years during that period.

And as to "omissions," there is not one, except of seven words in one sentence; an omission which you yourself do not pretend to make of any moment.*

With this exception it will, I believe, be found, that the text of the edition of 1850 on this subject remains as it stood in the second edition of 1817, and the only addition consists of a few extracts from Bradford in the notes.

So much, my Lord, for your charge of *change*.

But your Lordship adds still graver accusations. You openly accuse His Grace of "rank popery" and "heresy."

His Grace, in his comment on St. John, has urged upon those who bring children to be baptized, the duty and efficacy of earnest prayer for obtaining a blessing for the child; and he adds, that if this were more "generally practised," the full baptismal blessing would be more generally received. Your Lordship's observation upon this passage, is, that "to require as *necessary to the efficacy of the baptism of infants*, that there be faith on the part of those who present them, is little short, *if indeed short*, of heresy." (p. 13.) Nay, you tell us, that "this teaching is *rank Popery*, and *worse than Popery*," for whereas "the Council of Trent makes recourse to other intercessors and mediators with God than Christ, to be no more than a 'pious and useful practice,'" His Grace "makes it to be necessary to salvation;" and you "stand aghast" when you "hear such teaching from such a place." (p. 14.) Who can doubt, my Lord, the salutary horror you have of everything Popish, snuffing it even afar off at the greatest possible distance, and the keenness of your scent upon the present occasion is wonderful. And that Popery should have got to Lambeth, must indeed be a sore affliction to you. You "stand aghast" at "*such* teaching from *such a place*." But, my Lord, how will

* In the previous editions, there was this sentence:—"It is indeed a sufficient confutation of the doctrine of special grace, that it absolutely nullifies the Sacrament of Baptism; it reduces Baptism to an empty rite," &c. In the edition of 1850, the words "it absolutely nullifies the Sacrament of Baptism," are omitted.

you feel when I inform you, that you "stand aghast" fifteen years too late, and that for fifteen years you have been cherishing this "rank Popery and worse" with your "affectionate friendship." Yes, my Lord, all this *new* teaching, just concocted at Lambeth, has been before the world for fifteen years, and had during all that time your "affectionate friendship!"

But let us come closer to the point. He who charges his ecclesiastical superior with *heresy*, should be somewhat cautious, to say the least, that his inferences are borne out by the passages he cites. I beg to ask your Lordship, then, where the Archbishop has intimated in this passage, that faith on the part of those who bring a child to baptism is *necessary* to the efficacy of its baptism? Can your Lordship see no difference between God's giving a blessing to a child in answer to earnest prayer, and His refusing *ever* to give such a blessing in baptism *except* where such prayer has been offered? May not such a prayer bring a blessing, though it be not a *sine qua non* to the bestowal of such a blessing? If the Archbishop's statement is "rank Popery," what are St. Paul's exhortations to intercessory prayer? What is the language of St. James, "The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man *availeth much*,"—spoken of *intercessory* prayer? Has your Lordship yet to learn the distinction between the scriptural doctrine of the duty and *value* of intercessory prayer and the Popish doctrine of the mediation of dead saints, in matters about which they know nothing, issuing in leading the people to worship stocks and stones? And certainly the charge of Popery comes with but an ill grace from one who has boldly maintained, and inculcated upon his clergy, that the doctrine of our Church, as to the effects of Baptism, is identical with that of the Church of Rome.

In fact, if His Grace had expressed himself in still stronger terms, he would not have gone beyond the language of a document which your Lordship's party earnestly contend for as favoring their views, and an authority on their side of the question;—I mean the Cologne Liturgy. For we there find the minister, when officiating at the rite of Infant Baptism, directed to speak thus: "For in what place soever *they that*

believe in him come together in his name, he is present in the midst of them; and, *when he is called upon with faith,* he worketh in his word and Sacraments, (invocatus fide efficax est in verbo et sacramentis suis), and he performeth in deed whatsoever he offereth in his Sacraments and promiseth in his word." Were Bucer and Melancthon heretics for speaking thus? The former, indeed, if your Lordship is better acquainted with his views than your advocates shewed themselves to be, may not find much favor in your eyes; but will you stamp Melancthon also with the brand of heresy?

But what has caused me still greater amazement, is the special objection which your Lordship has adduced against this statement of His Grace. You say, "It is to make the first moving of God towards them—the grace annexed by Christ to his Baptism—contingent on the intention of man." My Lord, would any doctrine that could be devised, make the "first moving of God towards" infants so completely dependent upon man's will and intention, as that which absolutely prohibits us from supposing its existence in any case, until the parent chooses to bring the child to Baptism, and the minister chooses to baptize it? According to your Lordship's doctrine, it is entirely in the power of parents or minister to prevent any "moving of God towards" the child at all; and equally is it in their power to regulate the time when that "*first* moving" shall take place. In fact, it is as much in their power to give or withhold, and fix the time for, the first gift of spiritual grace, as if they were its authors.

Your Lordship proceeds to tell His Grace, that "the shock" under which you "stood aghast" at his "Popery," was "not lightened" by his adding his desire, that what he had been stating about the importance and value of intercessory prayer "were better understood, and this primitive, this scriptural, this reasonable Baptism, more generally practised."

You object, first, to its being called "primitive," and ask His Grace to bring any single Council or Father to countenance "such an assertion." If, my Lord, you refer to your own misrepresentation of the Primate's words, such a question is *intelligible,* but at the same time *irrelevant.* That the opera-

tions of God are *limited,* in the Baptism of infants, to the case of those for whom earnest and sincere intercessory prayer has been offered, has never been asserted by His Grace. But I trust that your Lordship will not venture to deny, that Baptism, so accompanied, has the best possible claim to the title, "*primitive* Baptism;" and that modern Christians may well be reminded, how strongly the mode of dealing with the rite, too frequent among them, contrasts with that which characterized the primitive Christians.

In kindness to His Grace, however, and to facilitate his answer to your inquiry, you present him with a specimen of your Lordship's researches into the Councils of the Church, in the following words, which are far too valuable not to be given entire:—

"Meanwhile as you have invited a consideration of the doctrine of the primitive Church on Baptism, you will not consider it irrelevant if I present you with a Canon of the Fourth Council of Carthage—*a Council, as I need not remind your Grace, received generally, and one whose Canons were adopted by the General Council of Chalcedon.* The First Canon of the Fourth Council of Carthage, which is *thus seen to have had the authority of the whole Catholic Church,* in giving 'rules for the examination of one elected to be a Bishop,' directs, among other things, as follows: 'Quærendum etiam ab eo si credat, &c. si in Baptismo omnia peccata, id est, tam illud originale contractum, quam illa quæ voluntarie admissa sunt, dimittantur.' Thus it appears that no one in the primitive Church could properly be ordained a Bishop, without its being first ascertained, that he believed original sin to be remitted in Baptism." (p. 15.)

My Lord, it is deeply to be regretted, that your Lordship *does* "need" *frequently** to be "reminded," and to a very considerable extent, of matters which it might have been hoped had been familiar to you; for such a blunder as we have here, proceeding from one in your Lordship's position, is a discredit to us all. It shows a want of acquaintance with the very elements of ecclesiastical literature. Are you really unconscious, my Lord, that these African Canons formed no part of the Code of the universal Church, no part of the Canons adopted

* See for instance the "Charge" of 1848.

by the General Council of Chalcedon? Nay, they formed no part of the Code of Canons of the African Church. Hear what Hardouin says of the Council which you have spoken of in such terms,—

"Of this Council Ferrandus Diaconus, Dionysius Exiguus, the Code of Canons of the African Church, and all the collectors of Canons, both Greek and Latin, are silent."* And it appears from Hardouin, that the MSS. in which these Canons are found vary much in the Title prefixed to them. Their supposed date lies between the years 398 and 436. So that this Canon, which is to show us what was required of every one "in the primitive Church" before his consecration as a bishop, was not enacted till at least *the end of the fourth century*.

Such, my Lord, is your Council; which you tell us you "*need not remind*" his Grace was "received generally," and its "canons adopted by the General Council of Chalcedon," and "had the authority of the whole Catholic Church"!! A goodly authority with which to attempt to browbeat your Metropolitan! A pregnant proof of your fitness for the office you have assumed in your Letter!

My Lord, I am really ashamed for our Church in having to expose such ignorance in one holding such a position in it. You are unacquainted, it seems, even with the "Code of Canons of the universal Church," and know not where to find it.

But I am forgetting that your Lordship will perhaps ask for some references on this point. My Lord, I beg pardon for omitting such a necessary piece of information. Not to mention, then, the larger Conciliar works, let me ask you to turn to Justelli et Voelli Bibliotheca Juris Canonici Veteris. (Paris, 1661.) Nay, it is unnecessary to go at all further than a very common little English work, compiled for young students in divinity, with suitable notes, by Johnson the Nonjuror, entitled "The Clergyman's *Vade-Mecum*." Let me commend to your attention his note (Pt. 2, p. 139) on the first Canon of the Council of Chalcedon, where you will find what "*is agreed on all hands*" in this matter.

* Silent de hoc Concilio Ferrandus Diaconus, Dionysius Exiguus, Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Africanæ, omnesque Canonum Collectores, tum Græci, tum Latini. Hard. Concil. ii. 975.

And now for your Canon itself. The Bishop elect is required by the Canon to testify his belief that all sins, both original *and those which have been voluntarily indulged,* are remitted in Baptism. I ask you then this question, How are "sins voluntarily indulged" remitted in Baptism? Are they remitted *necessarily, unconditionally,* by the *opus operatum* of Baptism? No. You yourself admit, that in the case of an adult, faith and repentance are necessary for the remission of his sins. Then, my Lord, your Canon leaves the question respecting the effects of Baptism in infants precisely where it found it. For the Canon no more requires the belief of the necessary remission of sins in the case of the Baptism of infants than in that of adults. That Baptism is the rite in and by which the gift of remission of sins is formally made over to mankind, no one denies. The question is, whether it is made over *necessarily* and *absolutely* to *everybody* in and by that rite. Your Lordship denies this yourself in the case of adults. And others take the liberty of denying it also in the case of infants. It is CONDITIONALLY made over in and by that rite to *all.* The words of the Canon, as Hardouin will tell you, were directed against the Pelagian heresy, which denied the existence of original sin.—And the Canon, my Lord, is excellent. Have you read the whole of it? You have called His Grace's attention to one part, showing what a Bishop was to *teach;* may I remind your Lordship of another, showing what a Bishop was to *be?*—"Qui episcopus ordinandus est, antea examinetur, si natura sit prudens, si docibilis, si moribus temperatus.... si humilis, si affabilis, si misericors," &c. Oh! that the Canon could be made our own!

You proceed to censure a passage in a Charge of his Grace delivered by him when Bishop of Chester, in 1841, in which he objects to a clergyman "speaking of justification by faith as if Baptism and newness of heart concur towards our justification." And you say you cannot understand this; adding,—

"Baptism *and* newness of heart cannot 'concur towards' the first act of 'our justification.' For 'newness of heart,' as well as justification, is a fruit of Baptism, since Holy Scripture calls Baptism 'the washing of regeneration, and of the renewal by the Holy

Ghost;' and it is said to St. Paul, 'Arise, wash away thy sins.'" (pp. 15, 16.)

My Lord, this passage requires the language you have yourself in the following page addressed to his Grace. "The text which you have produced in the passage I am considering has been, I grieve to be obliged to say, perverted by you, and 'added to' most awfully." Nay more, you have actually misquoted the Bible to obtain from it evidence in your favor. "Holy Scripture," you say, "calls Baptism 'the washing of regeneration and of the renewal by the Holy Ghost.'" My Lord, we should hardly expect such misrepresentation and misquotation of Holy Scripture at an examination of a National School. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done," says the apostle, "but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost" (*δια λουτρου παλιγγενεσιας, και ανακαινωσεως Πνευματος Αγιου*) (Tit. iii. 5). Now here, first, it is a mere matter of opinion whether the phrase "washing of regeneration" refers to Baptism, and according to our version and the *received** punctuation of the Greek, the "renewing of the Holy Ghost" is spoken of as *distinct* from the "washing of regeneration." But from this you manufacture the statement, "Holy Scripture CALLS BAPTISM 'the washing of regeneration and OF the renewal by the Holy Ghost!!'" For the meaning of the phrase "washing of regeneration" as applied to Baptism, and of the words used to St. Paul, I refer to the remarks just made as to the nature of the Baptismal rite.

But let us consider the passage itself of his Grace's Charge, which has called forth these remarks. It is written with specific and *expressed* reference to the statements of Tract 90, a fact which your Lordship has suppressed. Tract 90, commenting on the Statement of Art. XI., that "we are justified by faith only," uses these words,—"A number of means go to effect our justification. We are justified by Christ alone, in that he has purchased the gift; by faith alone, in that faith asks for it;

* I say "received," because it is not *authoritative*, the older MSS. not having stops. The punctuation therefore is *open* to criticism, and the passage consequently *open* to different interpretations. But this is no justification of the language referred to above.

by Baptism alone, for Baptism conveys it; and by newness of heart alone, for newness of heart is the life of it." (p. 13. 2nd ed.)

His Grace, in the Appendix to his Charge in 1841, observed upon this, that,—

"In his judgment a Clergyman would be departing from the sense of the Articles to which he subscribes, if he were.. to speak of Justification by Faith, as if Baptism and newness of heart concurred towards our justification; or as if 'a number of means go to effect it.' Art. xi.;" expressly referring here in a note to "Tract 90, p. 13. Letter [*i. e.* Dr. Pusey's Letter to Dr. Jelf], 141."

This teaching he justly repudiated; and it is not His Grace that is responsible for the phraseology, but the author of Tract 90. His Grace says, equally with your Lordship, that "baptism and newness of heart" cannot "concur towards our justification." But here I regret to find the agreement terminates, for the ground on which your Lordship objects to the statement is, that justification and newness of heart are both "fruits of Baptism." That is, like the Romanists, you practically deny the truth of the eleventh Article, that we are justified by faith only. In short, you take the ground formerly occupied by the Popish Bishop Gardiner, in his controversy with Archbishop Cranmer, who tells the Archbishop, that his discussion of the doctrine of Justification in the "Homily of Salvation," is wholly unnecessary in a Church where all are baptized as infants, "in which Sacrament of Baptism all we be justified before we can talk of this justification we strive for." (See Fox's Acts and Mon. Ed. 1838. vi. 49.)

And it is to defend the doctrine of Cranmer, and guard against the introduction of Popish errors, that the Archbishop objects to our "speaking of justification by faith," as if Baptism concurred towards our justification, (*i. e.* in the sense of the work he was quoting), as a means to effect it. Justification is promised and given to faith; and Baptism can no more give it than going through the form of institution can give a man a living to which he has not been rightly presented, or which he is not legally qualified to hold. It is not denied, but on the contrary affirmed, by the Archbishop, that by Baptism the gift of remission of sins is formally made over to men, in some cases absolutely, and in all others *conditionally;* but it is not,

properly speaking, a means to effect it. Take, for instance, the case of an adult baptized in a state of impenitence and unbelief. Does Baptism give him justification? No; your Lordship yourself denies that it does. How and when, then, does justification, if ever, come to him? When he believes, *i. e.* with that sincere and influential belief that is of a saving nature. And then the covenant made in Baptism as to the remission of sins to the penitent believer begins to take effect. But he is justified by faith only.

That "newness of heart" is the invariable fruit of infant Baptism, is a tenet I may safely leave undiscussed, as your Lordship is at issue with almost everybody, deserving the name of an authority, on that point.

Your Lordship proceeds to object to the phrase "scriptural," as applied to the Baptism of which His Grace speaks. Of your repeated misstatement of His Grace's doctrine, as if it made the *efficacy* of Infant Baptism altogether dependent upon the prayers of parents or sponsors, I take no notice; but, giving His Grace's words their obvious sense, I ask you whether the term is inappropriate to describe a Baptism accompanied with earnest and sincere prayer, as distinguished from one performed in a spirit of levity and indifference. Whatever your Lordship's views may be, I shall without fear leave the public to determine this question.

But you charge His Grace with "perverting" Scripture, and "most awfully adding to" it, because he said that our Lord "approved of the zeal of those parents" who brought their children to him; which, you tell us, "is not said—is not in any way *implied*, in the narratives of the Evangelists. *On the contrary*, they concur in representing our blessed Lord as not even alluding to the 'zeal of the parents who brought them,' —as confining himself altogether (as our Church expressly interprets it) to the innocency of the children," and you intimate that our Church has done the same.

What, my Lord, have you already forgotten (to say nothing of Holy Scripture) the Prayer Book, and the Baptismal Service too? What says that Service?—"Beloved, ye hear *in this Gospel* the words of our Saviour Christ; that he commanded, &c.; *how he blamed those that would have kept them from him*

.... Wherefore we.... nothing doubting but that he *favourably alloweth this charitable work of ours in bringing this infant to his Holy Baptism*, let us," &c. And are we to be told by a Bishop of our Church, that there is "in this Gospel" no intimation of approval of the zeal of those parents that brought their children to Christ, and that our Church avoids any intimation of a similar kind? My Lord, such attacks can injure only him who makes them.

That this language implies, that Christ's blessing was dependent upon the feelings of the parent, is an inference for which your Lordship alone is responsible; and one which touches the Prayer Book as much as the Archbishop.

But then, the worst of all, it seems, is, that His Grace has actually used the term "this *reasonable* Baptism," and you warn him against having anything to do with "human reason" in such matters; this "rationalizing process" *you* "leave to the schools of modern Germany and Geneva."

My Lord, you stand wholly acquitted of having had any communings with "human reason" in this matter. But why, let me ask, do you not quarrel first with St. Paul for having adopted such a "rationalizing process" as to remind Christians of their "*reasonable* service" (*την λογικην λατρειαν*), (Rom. xii. 1)), a passage which His Grace evidently had in his mind when he wrote what has called forth your Lordship's indignation? And when you have settled your difference with the Apostle, then surely it will be time enough, after convicting the Apostle, to commence with the Archbishop.

And do you really think it a "rationalizing process," worthy only of "modern Germany and Geneva," to exhort Christians that *reason* as well as Scripture requires, that when they offer their infants to God for his blessing, they should seek that blessing by earnest prayer? My Lord, "modern Germany and Geneva" are under great obligations to you for the admission, but far otherwise the Church of England.

You add two objections to what you call His Grace's "scheme" of making the efficacy of infant Baptism *dependent* upon the prayers of those who bring them; but as the "scheme" is your Lordship's, and not His Grace's, manufactured by yourself for the purpose of casting reproach upon

your Primate, I leave them at your Lordship's disposal for some other occasion, and am glad to assure you, that your fearful anticipations of having to "shudder" when the answer is given, will not be realized.

But the worst part of this "*new* matter," (which, nevertheless, like the rest, antedates the "affectionate friendship" of thirty years) remains yet to be told, and which your Lordship has "read with more surprise and concern than any other." (p. 20.) His Grace has actually referred, in proof of a fact, (that is, "the abuse of Baptism by some mistaken Christians in the fourth and fifth centuries") to Gibbon; and then, of course, as Gibbon was an infidel, and nobody ever reads or quotes Gibbon but those who have some regard for his irreligious views, it stands to reason, that His Grace, who is already proved to be so fond of the rationalizing processes of modern Germany and Geneva, must be far gone towards infidelity! Alarming discovery!

But, my Lord, is it Gibbon's name, or *the fact*, which causes so much pain? I suspect the latter. It touches a tender point,—"the abuse of Baptism;" and moreover, it cannot be denied that it *is* "a fact;" for your Lordship admits, that "the Fathers of the Church sufficiently avouch it," which makes the matter more trying; and, therefore, to get consolation out of it, you set about proving that even this abuse shows, that the Sacrament of Baptism "was, and is, a great 'reality,'" which I would humbly suggest that nobody denies. But it seems that the Archbishop has ventured to say, that the "abuse of baptism" thus referred to, (i. e. men waiting to receive it till on their death-bed; and fancying that they should thus get full remission of sins when all opportunity for sinning more had passed away) is a "lamentable evidence of the facility with which mankind run away from realities to ceremonies, and content themselves with the shadow of the spiritual substance." And your Lordship indignantly asks how he "can permit" himself to say this. What, my Lord, does this grate upon your ears? Are you really prepared to maintain, that Baptism under such circumstances is more than a "ceremony;" aye, than an impious mockery of God, calculated to bring increased condemnation; that it is more than "the shadow of the spiritual substance?" Be it so, then, my Lord. God grant,

that His Grace and all to whom the Church of Christ would wish God-speed, may ever bear the reproach of differing from you!

To prove that the preaching to people as if they were all regenerate persons, has no *tendency* to "lull them into a fallacious security" (as His Grace has stated it to have) you assure him that you never found a single instance of its so doing.

My Lord, I believe that both you and others may have rarely found any openly resting on such a ground of hope. And for this reason,—that there are few, *comparatively* very few, ungodly persons who really *believe* what I must be permitted to call the false doctrine of those who would fain teach them, that they are spiritually regenerate persons. Their conscience, their common sense, tells them that they are not. But, my Lord, the false teacher is no less responsible for his erroneous instruction. The character and the tendency of such teaching are not to be thus disproved. Nor will I waste time in discussing the question whether few or many are misled by it.

Your Lordship proceeds to criticise the Preface prefixed by His Grace, to his recent Edition of his work on Apostolical preaching.

And your first charge is one of self-contradiction. His Grace here says, that though he does not concur in the view, he "cannot doubt that a minister of our Church may justly maintain," that in infants "the spiritual benefit of baptism, 'a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness,' is only received where there has been an antecedent act of grace on the part of God." This, you say, contradicts a statement in the work itself, as to Baptism conveying regeneration. (pp. 22, 23.)

But how is this? *You*, my Lord, at least, cannot assert that the Archbishop has, in his Preface, contradicted the teaching of his work, taken (as it ought to be) as a whole. For you have quoted passages from his work, which have occurred in every Edition from the second in 1817 inclusive, as maintaining the very doctrine which he advocates in this Preface. And for once you are right. You have successfully proved, that so long ago as 1817, His Grace expressed sentiments of a similar kind to those contained in the Preface he has just prefixed to the

last Edition of his work. But your misfortune is, that when you are right, you have just proved what you did not want to prove. You have proved that there has been no change for more than thirty years. If there *is* contradiction, at any rate it existed, according to your own showing, when your "affectionate friendship" commenced thirty years ago.

You say, my Lord, that there are two different views maintained in the Book; and you tell us that certain passages (which you charge HisGrace with first introducing into the Edition just published, but which in reality were in the book more than thirty years ago) are *in agreement with the statements of the Preface just prefixed.* Then, my Lord, according to your own admission, you have at least His Grace's determination to which of the two views he adheres in his mature age. What more do you want? The utmost that can fairly be said is, that when, upon a reconsideration of the arguments of others, new matter was introduced in the second edition, derived from a more favourable view of the force of those arguments, it was not observed, that some of the previous statements might need modification.

Nor have you properly attended to the distinction, that is so necessary, between what His Grace has put forward as his own view, and what he has maintained to be allowable in others as reconcileable with an honest subscription to our Formularies.

Your next charge is, that His Grace has said that "Scripture declares the general necessity of Baptism, *without determining the actual effect of infant Baptism.*" And having first shown that "due reverence" you profess yourself so desirous of always giving to your Primate, by sarcastically reminding him of the assent and consent he has given to the Book of Common Prayer, you cite the Rubric,—"It is certain, by God's word, that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved;"—and you ask, whether this Rubric does not declare that Scripture *does* determine the actual effect of infant Baptism. You would "be sorry to deem it possible" that he should say it does not. You will not "listen to the avowal" but from his "own lips," or his "own pen." You "wait" for the "answer."

My Lord, it needs no information from His Grace to enable any one to assure you, that you will have to "wait" a long time. And you may well rest more than satisfied with silence.

But, as to the question you propose, you tell us yourself, that His Grace has "already said so by implication," by having "consented to the Judgment of the Judicial Committee." The public, my Lord, will need nothing more in the shape of an answer. They are well aware, that, whatever may be the habits of others, His Grace does not *say by implication* what he does not believe. You will stand alone, therefore, in seeking any further answer.

The Rubric itself I shall consider hereafter, when meeting your Lordship's objections to the remarks made upon it in the Judgment which has called forth this unseemly attack upon the Primate.

To that Judgment you now proceed to call attention; and you accompany your remarks with the following specimen of your respect and obedience for the authorities under which the Providence of God has placed you, and before whom you recently, without protest, pleaded your cause. Of a Judgment put forth by Her Majesty in Council, under the advice of five of her principal lay Judges, and both the Archbishops, you use the following language:—

You tell the Primate, that "instead of leading," he "misled those whom he was to instruct, not only by *mis-stating the matters on which he advised,* but also by *mis-quoting* all, or almost all, the authors cited by him in confirmation of his statement" (p. 25); that he has "sanctioned a decision that the Church over which he presides is no part of the Church of Christ;" and "done all which a declaration of his could do to cut off the Church in which he occupies the highest place, from communion with the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of all ages" (pp. 26, 27); that his "advice" to the Judicial Committee "was founded on *grounds which you forbear to characterize,* but which, even if they were true, were *nihil ad rem;*" (p. 28); that he "permitted" the Judges "to deceive themselves grossly." (p. 63.)

You tell Her Majesty, and the eminent Judges that advised her on this occasion, that their Judgment is one "marked by the most palpable misapprehensions, and therefore mis-statements of doctrine, and by omissions, unparalleled in any other similar document, of the true grounds on which *justice required* that the Judgment should be founded;" that it puts forth "a false and destructive declaration" (p. 26); that they "*wantonly*, and in spite of warning, omitted to give attention to a *conclusive* Canon;" and that, "for neglecting it—for deciding in contempt of it—you scruple not to say, whatever may be the legal consequences of so saying of such men, that they were GUILTY OF A GRIEVOUS VIOLATION OF THEIR PLAIN DUTY," and "have given a Judgment on grounds directly contradictory to the law of the Church" (pp. 63, 64); that their Judgment is not a precedent, but a warning—a warning to future Judges *to be content with doing their duty as Judges*, which duty is to administer, not to make, laws; to beware of listening to clamours from without, or timid caution from within" (p. 64); and you "aver" your "belief," "that *other motives besides mere justice and truth swayed this sentence, and His Grace in his advice upon it*," being "*so grievous a perversion of justice*." (p. 79.) And, finally, you protest against it, and avow your intention of disobeying it and setting at defiance your Primate and your Sovereign.

My Lord, it may be that such language will be permitted to pass without legal notice. But it will only be on one ground—that its character, and the quarter from which it proceeds, render it harmless. Among all the ravings of disappointed and infuriated Chartists, when the majesty of the law has put an end to their plans of tumult and revolution, I doubt whether anything could be found exceeding in violence these emanations from a Christian Bishop. My Lord, if you have no regard for your own character, at least remember what is due to the Church in which you bear so high an office. Is it in the same breath in which you give vent to such statements as these, that you venture to remind others of the Catechism and the Canons? Is it with such language as this upon your lips, that you complain of others neglecting their duty, and allowing themselves to be led away by private feelings and motives?

And what, after all, is the effect of this Judgment upon your position? Simply this. You had made a Procrustean bed without any authority, to which you were resolved to fit every body that came to your diocese. Woe to the man that was either too long or too short. The only choice was the rack or the knife. Unfortunately for your Lordship, one came who was resolved to test your right to either rack or knife, and the consequence is, that you have been most wisely deprived of both. Do you really suppose, my Lord, that your violent outcries will cause their restoration? Rather are they an additional proof of the necessity of taking them from you.

The parties whom you have been seeking to drive out of the Church, would sooner have cut off their right hands than broken out into such contemptuous revilings against the authorities under which God has placed them. Prepared they were, and that in no inconsiderable numbers, to quit a Church that should make your Lordship's doctrine on the subject of Baptism its own. Doubtless, also, they would have considered a Judgment that limited the interpretation of our Articles and Formularies to a sense which would have excluded the very men who drew them up, erroneous and unjust. But one thing they certainly would not have done; they would not have imputed to the Judges unworthy motives and a wanton disregard to the principles of justice. Least of all would they have hurled defiance at their Sovereign, and a sentence of excommunication against their ecclesiastical rulers. While they would have advocated the rights of conscience and sought to maintain the truth, they would have done so like peaceable citizens, like men who endeavoured to obey the *precepts* of their holy religion as well as to uphold its *truths*.

But I proceed at once to your arguments.

His Grace has remarked in his Preface (which your Lordship connects with the Judgment, I suppose, from the similarity of the quotations made in the two), that,—

"Unquestionably there is much difficulty, much mystery in the case, as regards the Baptism of infants; a difficulty which many divines have solved, by supposing that the spiritual benefit of Baptism, 'a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness,' is only

received where there has been an antecedent act of grace on the part of God."

And then he proceeds to cite a few passages in proof of the truth of this remark.

Your Lordship observes, that if this *were* so, it would prove nothing in Mr. Gorham's case, as this is *not* his view; and you quote passages from his answers to your questions to prove that such is the fact.

My Lord, it will, I think, be convenient if I enter at once upon the question, what are Mr. Gorham's views; and how far your Lordship has, in a subsequent part of your Letter (pp. 48—52), correctly stated them. It is impossible clearly to understand the point at issue, or the relevancy of the proofs and arguments that may be adduced on either side, without having before our eyes the *real* sentiments of both parties, disengaged from the imputations and glosses which may be attached to their words. Your Lordship brings two accusations against Mr. Gorham; which you state thus:—

"I. Whereas the Nicene Creed declares that there is 'one Baptism for the remission of sins,' . . . Mr. Gorham denies that it is remitted in Baptism to *any*. For he holds . . . that those infants only who receive Baptism *rightly*, i. e. having had an act of prævenient grace, receive any benefit from it." "II. The gifts which the Catholic Church, and in it our own, has ever taught and does teach to be given by God in and by the Sacrament of Baptism, Mr. Gorham teaches to be given *before* Baptism, whenever Baptism is received rightly; ascribing these gifts either to the prævenient act of grace, which, as to infants, he has adopted from the inventions of men, not from the Word of God, or to faith, which our Church declares that infants cannot have. These gifts are 'remission of sins,' or justification; being 'born again,' or regeneration; being *made* 'the child of God,' or adoption. Of these Mr. Gorham declares that *regeneration* takes place *before* Baptism, through the act of prævenient grace, in direct contradiction to our Lord's words (according to the sense of the whole Church and our own Baptismal Office), 'Except a man be born of water and the Spirit.' Thus he separates regeneration wholly from Baptism, as in no way an effect of it, since, according to him, it *precedes* it."

And you add, that he speaks in the same way of "the new nature," "adoption," and "remission of sins," &c. And therefore you say that you rejected him because,—

"1st. That by declaring original sin to be a hindrance to the benefit of Baptism, he denied the Article of the Creed, 'One Baptism for the remission of sins;' 2d. That he separated entirely 'the inward and spiritual grace' from the Sacrament, inasmuch as he stated 'regeneration' to *precede* Baptism, when Baptism was rightly received." (See pp. 48—52.)

These are your charges, and you tell us that you can "hardly describe, with what amazement you found these heresies glossed over, or almost unnoticed, in the Judgment," and wonder how the Archbishop can have been "betrayed into countenancing such entire mis-statement of [Mr. Gorham's] unsound doctrine," as that given in the Judgment.

My Lord, the great question is, on which side lies the guilt of the incorrect "gloss." And I must also add, that some of your Lordship's statements, in this endeavour to convict Mr. Gorham of heresy, are calculated to excite equal "amazement" with any which your Lordship can have felt in reading the Judgment. But I will let that pass, and proceed to show the way in which yourself and others, labouring to establish your *opus operatum* doctrine of this sacrament, have misrepresented Mr. Gorham's views by a partial and defective exhibition of them.

My Lord, you need not to be informed, that there are two different views on this subject, characterizing the schools to which you and Mr. Gorham respectively belong, (of any others I am not now speaking) which, in general terms, may be thus stated.

The former is, that the Sacrament of Baptism is by God's appointment, and affixed grace, the primary source of all life-giving influence to man; so that in and by Baptism, that is, the *opus operatum* of the Baptismal Act, and by that alone, remission of sins and spiritual regeneration are absolutely, and without reference to conditions or qualifications, conferred upon man. And that this is the meaning of the Article of the

Nicene Creed, "One Baptism for the remission of sins." Every one baptized is *ipso facto* spiritually regenerated. The obvious repulsiveness, however, of such a notion in the case of adults, has induced the majority of those who incline in the direction of this view, to stop short at the case of infants, and to deny this doctrine in the case of adults. Among these is your Lordship, though many of your statements are consistent only with the former view. And thereby you nullify at once a large number of your proofs and arguments, and make your reference to the Creed palpably absurd; for if *the words themselves*, taken alone, prove that remission of sins is necessarily given in the case of *infants*, they must prove the same in the case of *adults*. This, your advocate, Mr. Badeley, clearly saw; and, therefore, to preserve consistency in his argument, boldly stood to the whole doctrine in all its integrity. And if your Lordship wishes to see this doctrine fully insisted on, without any timid reservations or scruples, such as have usually been observable even in authors of this school, I commend you to Archdeacon Wilberforce's last work. You will there find how entirely reconcileable it is both with reason and revelation, that everybody baptised should be in and by Baptism spiritually regenerated, and have all the powers of their nature renovated, and have "Christ dwelling in them," even though their will remains corrupt and they may be none the better for it.* But this by the way.

The other view is, that the Sacrament of Baptism has been appointed by God as the rite by which the privilege of sonship, with its accompanying blessings, is *formally made over* to man, *at once* and absolutely to those who by God's *previous* favor have been placed in a position which causes the rite to be efficacious, and who possess God's *grant* of the privilege, and *conditionally*, that is, upon the conditions of subsequent faith and repentance, to *all*. But no *opus operatum* efficacy is conceded to the rite itself. The privilege of sonship is given by it, but

* I would here observe, that I fully purpose taking an early opportunity of further noticing this work; but partly from other occupations, and partly from wishing to meet at the same time other remarks that might be made on my work on Baptism, I have hitherto delayed doing so; not fearing, I must confess, that such views as those I have noticed above would be likely to gain many converts.

only upon the strength of, and in accordance with, the grant of that privilege by God. That privilege is absolutely made over by it, only where it has been previously, or at the time, *granted* by God,—a grant independent of Baptism. And where it is conditionally made over, the rite has efficacy, only when,—the condition being, by God's grace, fulfilled,—the actual grant is made by God.

This doctrine, then, leads in the case of infants to more than one view as to the effects of Baptism upon them. By some it is held, that all infants of a Christian parent* are so within the bond of the covenant, that the guilt of original sin, under which they are born, will not be imputed to them, the apostle distinctly representing such as "holy" (1 Cor. vii. 14), and consequently, that in Baptism the remission of original sin (with which alone they can be chargeable) is in all cases formally made over to them. They do not, however, consider this to be equivalent to spiritual regeneration. Others, however, not prepared to maintain that all these infants are in such a position by their birth of a Christian parent, believe, that as in the case of an adult, there must be some previous grant of grace by God, in order that there may be a present and absolute beneficial effect from Baptism, so we must suppose the same to be necessary in the case of infants, who, being by nature under the guilt of original sin, cannot be considered as *necessarily entitled* to the remission of sin and the gift of spiritual life in and by Baptism. This latter is Mr. Gorham's view.

It is clear, then, how easy it is for an antagonist of very moderate acuteness, by directing attention to certain words used in different senses, and keeping out of sight the general doctrine held, to make the views of one who holds tenets of this kind appear very different from what they are in reality.

Thus your Lordship charges Mr. Gorham with denying that anything is ever given in Baptism, because he attributes regeneration and adoption to a prævenient act of Divine grace. But this is palpably incorrect. These blessings are not, in-

* There is no sufficient scriptural authority for the baptism of any infants but those of a Christian parent, except under peculiar circumstances.

deed, supposed by him to be given in Baptism, in the sense in which your Lordship required him to admit that they were; but he does not deny that they are, in suitable cases, formally made over, and *in that sense given*, in and by Baptism. And his denials that they are ever given in or by Baptism are, clearly, directed only against that *opus operatum* doctrine of your Lordship with which he had to contend; not against that view of their being given by Baptism, which I must be permitted to call the orthodox one. When considering his answers, we must keep in mind the *animus* and intentions with which the *questions* were put to him, and judge accordingly of their meaning. And we meet, in more than one place, with intimations of his mind in this matter. Thus, in a passage quoted by your Lordship (p. 51), he says, "the blessing of 'adoption' also precedes Baptism *in its essence* [observe the limitation], but it is declared, attested, and manifested by that sacrament as (ordained to be) a seal or sign of the gift;" and then he adds (what your Lordship has omitted to cite, though it is part of the sentence), "which I maintain to be a very different proposition from this other, namely, that the blessing of regeneration or adoption to be a member of the family of God, is to be *ascribed* TO *Baptism*." Here we see what it was he was opposing—your Lordship's *opus operatum* doctrine of ascribing all these blessings TO Baptism; and therefore he is so cautious in the expressions he uses as to the effects of Baptism, that he might not give the smallest countenance to such unsound doctrine.*

Impartial persons, my Lord, could see this; and therefore the eminent Judges who had to decide the question of his orthodoxy, took that which was the only fair and just course. They viewed his statements as *a whole;* they saw what he was contending against, and therefore the reason for his cautious language; and, by a just and fair mode of reasoning from his answers, taken together, they correctly deduced his doctrine. And because it is a fair representation of it, you and others

* Hence the apparent contradiction in the statements, that adoption, &c. may be given before or *in* or after Baptism (Exam. p. 71.), and that adoption is *not* given *in* Baptism (p. 113), is *only apparent* and not real. The former relates to the *Divine grant*, the latter to the mere *opus operatum* of the Baptismal act.

quarrel with it. Like too many hot and prejudiced controversialists, you want to give such a description of it as will do it most damage, and therefore you give isolated portions of his statements, which, taken alone, and with *your interpretation of their meaning*, would give an erroneous impression of his views.

My Lord, it is perfectly true, that, *in the sense in which you use the word "given,"* nothing *is* EVER given to man, woman, or child, by Baptism; that is, nothing is given through the *mere performance of the Baptismal act.* But there is no denial here that in the proper sense of the word "given," as applied to the Sacrament of Baptism, a great deal is given by Baptism. There is no denial here of its value and efficacy for the purpose for which it was instituted.

That Baptism is the formal and official act by which the minister, acting in the name and authority of Christ, gives remission of sins, is denied by no one with whom we are now concerned. But the act is a *ministerial* act, and its value depends upon its being subservient to a *Divine grant* made before, or in, or after the act, on grounds agreeable to the Divine will, *whatever we may consider them to be.* Mr. Gorham does not deny that remission of sins is given by Baptism, in the sense in which alone the phrase can be scripturally used. But he denies it in the sense for which your Lordship contended; that is, in the *opus operatum* sense of the Church of Rome. He denies what your Lordship, with the Church of Rome, in effect though not in words, maintains,—that every minister of Christ has power and authority given him by God to make over to any infant, at his pleasure, remission of sins and spiritual regeneration, by performing upon him the rite of Baptism; and that God's acts are dependent upon those of the minister; which is, in fact, a daring assumption of the Divine prerogative to forgive sins, cloaked only by the thin veil of the admission that the performance of a certain rite is necessary for the exercise of that prerogative.

My Lord, the Article of the Creed, to which you refer, will prove nothing for your cause. Do the words, "One Baptism for the remission of sins," prove that every one baptized has remission of his sins? No; you yourself admit that they do not in the case of adults. Neither, therefore, do they of ne-

cessity in the case of infants. Moreover, whence are these words taken? Clearly from Acts ii. 38. "Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins (εις αφεσιν ἁμαρτιων), and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." So the Creed says, Ὁμολογουμεν ἑν βαπτισμα εις αφεσιν ἁμαρτιων. Precisely so; "*Repent,*" and then, as God has promised forgiveness to repentance, the rite of Baptism will formally and visibly make over to you remission of sins. But the gift of remission comes really and truly through repentance, and only visibly, formally, and ministerially through Baptism.

Take the case of St. Paul. What was our Lord's testimony to Ananias respecting him before his Baptism? He is "*a chosen vessel unto me,* &c." (Acts ix. 15.) But Ananias, after hearing these words, when he comes to him, says, "Arise, *and be baptized, and wash away thy sins,* calling on the name of the Lord." (Acts xxii. 16.) Remission of sins was given to him formally, and visibly, and officially by Baptism. Why? On account of Baptism itself? No; but because he was in the eye of God an accepted person. To use the words of P. Lombard himself (spoken with reference to a similar case), "*ante intus erat judicio Dei, sed nunc etiam judicio Ecclesiæ intus est.*"

Again; what does St. Peter say? "The like figure whereunto, even Baptism, doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but *the answer of a good conscience towards God*) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." (1 Pet. iii. 21.) It is not the outward rite, but "the answer of a good conscience toward God," that brings the blessing.

The case of infants, therefore, must be judged of accordingly. And if your Lordship had taken the ground that our infants are the proper subjects of Baptism as the children of Christians, inasmuch as such children are called "holy" by the apostle, and are to be considered as interested while infants in the Covenant made with their parents,* so that they must be viewed as, to a certain extent, objects of the Divine mercy, and therefore that Baptism seals and makes over to them the remission of the guilt

* It should be remembered, that the chief arguments for the practice of Infant Baptism are derived from these considerations.

of original sin, your Lordship would have stood on very different ground from that on which you now stand. But this doctrine you distinctly repudiate. Nothing will satisfy you, but the absolute power of giving remission of sins to *every* infant at your sovereign will and pleasure, by the *mere act* of baptizing it. And further, the question, be it remembered, between your Lordship and Mr. Gorham, is not, what precise view has the best foundation to rest upon; but whether Mr. Gorham's view is not tenable in strict consistency with all the Articles and Formularies of the Church of England. And the truth is, that it has been undeniably held in our Church by multitudes of our most eminent divines from the period of the Reformation.

Moreover, beyond all this, the doctrine which your Lordship has been endeavouring to force on Mr. Gorham and the Church, is, that every infant is, of necessity, in and by Baptism, made partaker of *spiritual regeneration* in its highest sense of imparting a new nature; which is a totally distinct question from that which relates to the remission of the guilt of original sin in Baptism, on which you and your party are *now* almost solely insisting; but which you can never prove to be *required* to be held by all who minister in our Church, even in the limited sense to which I have just alluded.

Look, my Lord, at the consequences of your doctrine. You say, for instance, that spiritual regeneration is given, and only given, in and by Baptism. Take, then, the case of an impenitent and unbelieving adult, not yet baptized. Does Baptism confer upon him the gift of spiritual regeneration? Your Lordship admits that it does not. Then, if such a man afterwards repents and believes, he must be rebaptized to obtain spiritual regeneration. But rebaptization you acknowledge to be inadmissible. Consequently you deny the possibility of such a man ever obtaining spiritual regeneration, even if he afterwards repent and believe.

And your admission that spiritual regeneration is not in all cases the necessary effect of Baptism, nullifies more than half your proofs and arguments for the inseparability of spiritual regeneration from infant Baptism; because they apply to the case of Baptism *generally*, and therefore, if you admit that they are to be understood with a limitation in the case of *adults*,

they will not prove that spiritual regeneration always attends *infant* Baptism; but you are driven to rest the onus of proof on an entirely different consideration, that is, on an unsupported assumption as to the state of infants, contradicting the doctrine of original sin. Mr. Badeley, therefore, resolving to be at least consistent in his arguments, boldly maintained that spiritual regeneration was given in and by Baptism, even to impenitent and unbelieving adults. And your Lordship has no option, but either to relinquish your doctrine, or to do the same.

Again; mark the self-contradiction in which you are involved. You say that all infants receive remission of sin and spiritual regeneration in and by Baptism, *because of their innocency* (pp. 17, 18), and yet that the guilt of original sin rests upon them in all its force, until it is washed away by Baptism. They are *guilty*, but yet they are *innocent* beings. This is the consequence of your incorrect view of the nature of the Baptismal rite, to which, in itself, you ascribe everything. View it in its true light, as the public and formal act by which the minister *makes over* the *Divine* grant, in some cases absolutely and at once, and in all others conditionally, and we see at once how infants may be considered as washed from the guilt of original sin by their Baptism, and yet may have had a previous interest in the Divine favour, either (as Mr. Gorham holds) from a prævenient act of Divine grace, or as the children of a believing parent, or otherwise. And thus we are not required to suppose them innocent, to make them suitable recipients of the Divine blessing, and at the same time guilty, to make them need remission of sins.

And there is this ludicrous inconsistency in your Lordship's statements. That while you are professedly contending for a high view of the efficacy of the Sacrament of Baptism, overstating it in the case of infants, you are making it a nullity in the case of unbelieving adults. For spiritual regeneration being, according to your notion, *the* effect of Baptism, if that is not given, nothing is given. Now, my Lord, even in their case it is not a nullity. For *this* is made over *even to them* in it, that, upon faith and repentance, they shall have remission of sins. They so far become interested in the Gospel Covenant,

that it is confirmed and sealed to *them individually* in and by Baptism. Otherwise they ought, upon faith and repentance, to be re-baptized. In all cases it is "baptism for the remission of sins." And the benefit of it is enjoyed by them as soon as their state corresponds with its conditions.

And so with our infants. They are *all* made partakers of an interest in the Gospel Covenant in and by Baptism, *so far as this*, that they have a right by promise to *all* its blessings, so soon as their state corresponds with its conditions. Their state *may* correspond with its conditions at the moment of Baptism, having been made so *in* or even *before* Baptism; for who shall dare to limit the Holy One of Israel in his gifts? Or it may not so correspond with its conditions till some years after. And this is what is meant when it is said (as by Mr. Gorham) that spiritual regeneration may take place in, or before, or after Baptism. There is no denial here that the gift of spiritual regeneration, even where made, in one sense, previous to baptism, is sealed and formally made over in and by Baptism, and therefore may be said to be conferred sacramentally by Baptism. And where regeneration takes place after Baptism, there it is made over *conditionally* in and by Baptism. The privilege of sonship is given sacramentally, and therefore the party is made, in the eye of the Church, a member of Christ and a child of God; but the real enjoyment of the privilege is postponed and conditional.

That regeneration may be granted previous to Baptism, and yet be properly said to be formally made over by Baptism, we may see by comparing Baptism with the required form of admission into any society or brotherhood to which the right of nomination lies with the Sovereign, and for which certain qualifications are necessary. There are certain officers appointed, whose duty it is to perform the required form of admission. Does the performance of that form make any one a member of that society? Doubtless in one sense it does. It is, in fact, the appointed mode of entry into it. The public do not recognize any one as belonging to it, until he has been, in *this* way, introduced into it. And, strictly speaking, he does not belong to it, before he has been *thus* made a member of it. But is he made a member of the society by the mere *opus*

operatum of going through this form? No; in that sense the performance of the rite does *not* EVER give it to him. And in this sense (which is your Lordship's sense), Mr. Gorham most justly denies that Baptism *ever* gives spiritual regeneration. There must be in the party who goes through the form the necessary qualifications and the necessary nomination by the Sovereign, or the form, of itself, the mere *opus operatum*, will do nothing.

But are we to be told that those who should speak of the form in such terms would make it a thing of no value, of no efficacy—a *mere* form, bestowing nothing? No; it is of the greatest value and efficacy; it *gives* the privilege of brotherhood; but *only* where the due qualifications are present, and *only* in the way of an instrument by which a gift *previously* bestowed by the Sovereign is formally made over.

The object for which I bring this illustration,* is to show that it may be held, that spiritual regeneration has been given before Baptism, and yet that in that same case the party baptized is made the son of God in and by Baptism; because the former words refer to God's original act, corresponding to the act of the Sovereign in the case of which we have been speaking; and the latter to the act of the Church which, as God's minister, publicly and formally makes over to the party that which God had given.

And we must observe, that, as it respects Baptism, the performance of the rite makes over the blessings of the Covenant *conditionally* to *all* who partake of it.

All that is necessary to understand this matter aright is, to keep in view the *real nature* of the Baptismal rite; that it is not a rite by the mere use of which man can absolutely give to whom he pleases, even in the case of infants, the blessings of God's covenant of mercy; but is the rite by which the blessings of the Covenant are publicly and formally made over to man in accordance with the terms of the Covenant; in some cases absolutely and at once, and in others

* I mention this, because I do not bring forward the illustration as holding good in every respect.

conditionally. Almost all the errors respecting Baptism arise from its not being viewed as only the instrument by which God's gifts are bestowed in the way and upon the terms that are accordant with his promises.

The case of infants may be illustrated by that of adults. Baptism is the rite which, by the appointment of God, makes over to men, publicly and formally, the privilege of being sons of God and members of Christ. Consequently, if you baptize a number of adults, you call them *all*, after their Baptism, members of Christ and children of God; and you say, and justly say, that they were made so in and by their Baptism, that being the rite appointed by God for admission to such a state. But will you affirm dogmatically, that they are all, of necessity, true members of Christ and children of God? You are conscious that you could not do so. Yet, nevertheless, if you were to draw up a Catechism for their use, you would speak of what took place in Baptism precisely as you do in the Catechism for children in the Prayer Book. It would be understood as a matter of course, that the language was used on the hypothesis that Baptism had been rightly received, and had therefore really made over this character to the baptized; while *the fact* would be, that such character had only been, in many cases, conditionally made over, and the parties might *really* be, in the sight of God, though not in the eye of the Church, "in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity." Is there anything unintelligible, anything *disingenuous*, in this? The disingenuousness, my Lord, would be in those who, for the purpose of maintaining the false doctrine that all adults are of necessity made really and truly and absolutely members of Christ and children of God by their Baptism, charged others with perverting such language, because they received it in a sacramental sense. Apply, then, the same reasoning to the case of infants.

And further, in the case of adults, it is clearly seen, that the supposition of an act of prævenient *regenerating* grace before Baptism, is perfectly consistent with the view, that regeneration, or the privilege of being members of Christ and children of God, is publicly and formally made over to men in and by

Baptism; and that Baptism, even in cases where it is immediately effectual, is only the instrument by which a gift, which in a sense is already possessed, is publicly and formally made over. The inward and spiritual grace of Baptism is the being made members of Christ and children of God; and the outward rite of Baptism is the means by which that grace is publicly and formally made over to men; and a pledge to assure us of its reception—of its *immediate* reception, if our state is at the time such as is requisite for its reception, and at least of its future reception, if our state, though not such then, should afterwards become so.

But that such a privilege should be, at the moment of Baptism, absolutely made over to adults, it is *necessary* that regenerating grace should have been *previously* received, and therefore that, in the eye of God, the party baptized should be a person spiritually regenerate; his condition being, in fact, precisely similar to that of one who presents himself to receive formal admission into a society or body of which he has a *right*, by the *grant* of the proper authority and the possession of the necessary qualifications, to demand to be made a member. *Technically*, no doubt, he is *not* a member until he has gone through the required form of admission; but *by right*, and intrinsically, he *is*. And so we find St. Peter *grounding* the claim of Cornelius and his friends to Baptism, upon their having *already* "received the Holy Ghost." (Acts x. 47.) And Cyril of Jerusalem, referring to this case, says that St. Peter directed him to be baptized, "in order that, *his soul* HAVING BEEN REGENERATED *through faith*, his body also might, through Baptism, receive grace."* And in the context he distinctly recognizes the separability of the outward Baptism and the regenerating influence of the Holy Spirit.†

And how little idea the early Fathers had of intimating, that regenerating grace was not possessed before Baptism, when they

* Ἵνα, της ψυχης δια της πιστεως αναγεννηθεισης, μεταλαβη και το σωμα δια του ὑδατος της χαριτος. CYRIL. HIEROS. Catech. 3. § 2. ed. 1703. p. 36.

† On John iii. 5. he remarks,—Ουδε τω ὑδατι βαπτιζομενος, μη καταξιωθεις δε του Πνευματος, τελειαν εχει την χαριν. ID. ib. p. 35.

spoke of regeneration taking place in or by Baptism, and how far they were from meaning to imply the modern *opus operatum* view of that sacrament, may be seen from the language used by St. Clement of Alexandria in the second century as to the Baptism of our Blessed Saviour. For, quoting the words of Scripture (putting two passages together), "Thou art my beloved Son, *this day have I begotten thee,*" he speaks of them as fulfilled at Christ's Baptism, and that our Lord was then "*regenerated.*"*

And your Lordship will not fail to remember Mr. Gorham's reference † to what took place at the Baptism of our Lord as "illustrating" his view of what takes place at our Baptism; that the blessing of adoption is not to be ascribed *to* Baptism *itself,* but is only formally attested and made over by it to those to whom it belongs. And you here see that Clement uses the very word "regeneration," with reference to that very case, *in a sense implying no more than this.* So that the use of the word "regeneration" by the Fathers in connexion with Baptism, can be of no avail to show, that they did not hold that a rightful claim to sonship might be possessed *before* Baptism. And I would just add, that in the context Clement clearly manifests his view of the necessity of faith to salutary Baptism; and also observes, that "where faith is, there is the promise."‡

But, nevertheless, you will, no doubt, contend, (and I agree with you) that, whatever previous regenerating grace may have been given to any persons, they are properly said to be made members of Christ and children of God in and by Baptism; because that is the rite appointed by God for the formal making over by the Church, as his minister, of that character, and admitting the party into the fellowship of the saints. How, then, can you deny, that the same thing may be justly said, for the same reason, in the case of infants? How can you assert, that he who requires *in their case* a prævenient act of regenerating grace, does thereby deny that they are made in Baptism members of Christ and children of God?

* Σημερον αναγεννηθεις ὁ Χριστος. Pædag. I. 6. *init.* (Ed. Col. 1688.)
† Examination, p. 112.
‡ Ου δε ἡ πιστις, εντανθα ἡ επαγγελια.

The great, vital, and fatal objection to your Lordship's doctrine, is briefly this; that you make the mere *opus operatum* of Baptism the source of spiritual life to the soul. You thereby place yourself almost in the position of God himself. You boldly aver, that in the case of all infants, wherever found, and under whatever circumstances, you can give or withhold remission of sins and spiritual life; that these gifts are so tied to Baptism, that until you choose to give Baptism, God himself cannot (without some extraordinary interference) give those gifts; that you have only to sprinkle the child with water and utter a few words, and the thing is done. Prayers may be offered if people think fit; you do not (as your apologist "C." coolly observes,) "*in any way* OBJECT to that." But that, and everything else except the act of baptizing, is a matter of indifference. Remission of sins and spiritual life are the necessary and invariable result of your act. You therefore can leave in a state of spiritual death, and you can make alive. My Lord, this is of the essence of that apostasy whose characteristic is to "sit in the temple of God, showing himself to be God;" to be (as the Head of that apostasy has been called) a Vice-God upon earth.

Having thus cleared the way for a consideration of your animadversions on the Judgment and the authorities adduced in its support, by a statement of the leading features of the doctrine of the two parties to the cause, I proceed at once to the remarks which stand next in order in your "Letter." They relate to the extracts given by His Grace in his "Preface" from various authors, and repeated in the "Judgment;" and your Lordship undertakes to prove to the world, that those authors are "all, or almost all," misquoted, their views being entirely different from what His Grace there represents them to be; with what success, I shall now endeavour to show.

I must first observe, however, that when you say that these quotations, if correct, would be irrelevant, your remark is grounded only upon your misrepresentation of Mr. Gorham's doctrine already adverted to,—that is, your charge against him, that because he does not consider spiritual privileges to be

given by Baptism in *your* sense, therefore he denies *in toto* that they are in *any* sense given or made over by Baptism. And having thus pointed this out, I shall not consider it necessary to revert to it every time you repeat the remark.

The Archbishop first cites Hooker, remarking,—"Hooker alludes to this, when he speaks of Baptism as 'a seal, perhaps, of the Grace of election before received.'"

These words are surely plain enough. And the context which your Lordship quotes only makes the sense of the passage more clear in favour of what the Archbishop adduces it to prove. For it commences thus, "*Predestination* bringeth not to life without the grace of external vocation wherein our Baptism is implied." And then Baptism is spoken of as "a seal, perhaps, of the grace of election before received," Hooker *adopting and admitting the truth of these words of Cartwright.* His Grace, therefore, merely states an *obvious fact,* when he says, that in these words Hooker alludes to, and sanctions, the view of grace being received before Baptism. What Hooker corrects in Cartwright is, the erroneous statement, that we are not "made Christians by Baptism," because, although there may have been such prævenient electing grace, yet the *order* of God's dispensations is not thus set aside, and the rite of Baptism is that by which we are formally admitted into God's Church, and, therefore, that which (as your Lordship cites the words,) "both declareth and maketh us Christians," "the door of our *actual* entrance into Christ's house, the first APPARENT beginning of life," and "to our sanctification *here,* a step that hath not any before it." Clearly so. Is there anything here contrary to Mr. Gorham's view? Not one word.

Your Lordship "heartily wishes" that His Grace "had read the whole of the sentence."

My Lord, it is to be "heartily wished" that you had given yourself time to understand it.

And your Lordship will remember, that this is but one out of various passages of Hooker that might be, and have been, quoted against you.

You proceed to the quotation from Archbishop Usher, which

is given from the work called "A Body of Divinity," first published, *as I have long ago pointed out,** without his consent, and not "in the state in which he himself would have published it;" and you say that "the words are not Usher's," quoting a letter of Usher's, given in Dr. Elrington's Life of him, stating that the Book consisted of collections from Cartwright and Crook, and "some other English divines," and "not approved in all places by the collector;" and catching at the offensive name (though not, it seems, to Usher) of Cartwright, you at once maintain, (though necessarily in total ignorance of the fact) that the words were Cartwright's, and that Usher disapproved of them! My Lord, the great question is, whether the words may not be properly considered as conveying Usher's doctrine. And what are the facts? The portion of the work devoted to the subject of Baptism occupies several folio pages, and the whole of it proceeds upon the doctrine contained in the words quoted. Two or three editions of the work appeared in Usher's lifetime, attributing its method and substance to him as the compiler, *after* its first publication as his work had been thus objected to by him, and no repudiation of any portion of it was ever made by him. On the contrary, we are told by the Editor of one of the later editions of it, that he, "*in his elder days, blessed God for its publication, though at first it started into the world without his consent, because he perceived it had done much good; which those have affirmed to hear him say, which had no fondness for the book.*"† Think you, my Lord, he would have blessed God for its publication, if he had held its whole doctrine on the subject of Baptism to be erroneous? You quote his Chaplain, Dr. Bernard, as saying, "Being so unpolished, defective, and full of mistakes, he was much displeased at the publishing it in his name." But you, or the author from whom you cite this, ought to have added, that Dr. Bernard further says, "*but hearing of some good fruit which hath been reaped by it, he hath permitted it.*" (Life of Usher, p. 42.)

But you add, that you will "adduce some evidence that he

* Effects of Infant Bapt. 1st ed. p. 312; 2nd ed. p. 344, 345.

† I quote from the eighth edition, 1702, 4to. The words appeared first, I believe, in the 7th ed. a. 1677.

held a doctrine *the very contrary* to what" His Grace "ascribes to him," and you quote a passage from his Sermons, in which he says, that "God hath appointed his Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to strengthen and continue that life which we received in Baptism as by spiritual nourishment. In Baptism our stock of life is given us, by the Sacrament is confirmed and continued." Why, my Lord, these are almost the very words, and precisely the sense, of the note to 1 Cor. xii. 13. in the Geneva Bible, which runs as follows,—

"That we might be one body with Christ, and the whole Church one Christ: of the which conjunction Baptism and the Lord's Supper are *effectual signs*: for *by Baptism we are regenerate into one Spirit*, and by the Lord's Supper we are incorporate into Christ's Body, to be governed by the same Spirit."

Here, then, is the old blunder again, of quoting statements such as the highest Calvinists use on the subject, as authorities on your side of the question. And I might say to your Lordship what you have said to the Archbishop; that after all, you have only been quoting an author like Cartwright—the Geneva comment on the Bible. It might have been hoped, my Lord, that recent experience would have taught you the necessity of a little more caution on this subject. But I am compelled to say, that, even to the present time, you seem to have no clear idea of the real point at issue. Indeed, if it had not been so, your case could never have been presented to the Courts which have had to decide upon it in such a state of confusion as it was, and which called forth the complaints of *both* respecting the condition of uncertainty in which they were left as to the precise question before them. The *great* point at issue between yourself and those whom you are assailing is, whether the Sacrament of Baptism is placed by God in the hands of man as the SOURCE of remission of sins and spiritual life to the soul, to be used by him *ad libitum* in the case of infants, (the more consistent of your party adding, the case of adults also); or whether it is the rite for formally conveying and making over to man a state of pardon, regeneration, and adoption, *in accordance with and dependence upon* the provisions and conditions

of the Gospel Covenant. The different estimate formed under different theological systems, of the nature of that Covenant, will of course produce differences of opinion among those who agree in adopting the latter view. But the great question now at issue in the Church is, which of those two views of the Sacrament of Baptism is the correct one. And they who hold that a prævenient act of grace, as for instance the grace of election, is necessary to qualify infants for the reception, at the moment of Baptism, of the full Baptismal blessing, declare nevertheless, in full accordance with that doctrine, that the state of spiritual life is made over in and by Baptism, agreeably to the latter view given above of the nature of the Baptismal rite. But, reasonably enough, when they are disputing with one who wants to drive them to the maintenance of the former view, they are exceedingly cautious as to the expressions they use respecting the way in which Baptism works to that end.

This passage, therefore, will not afford your Lordship the smallest aid. And why do you pass over those that have been placed before you from writings that, beyond all question, are Usher's? Take the following,—

"Election being nothing else but the purpose of God, resting in his own mind, makes no kind of alteration in the party elected, but only the execution of that decree and purpose, which, in such as have the use of reason, is done by an effectual calling, *in all by spiritual regeneration, which is the new birth, without which no man can see the kingdom of God* . . . but if any shall say, that by all, thereby I should understand the universality of all and every one in the world, and not the universality of *all the elect alone, he should greatly wrong my meaning.*"*

Can words be found more clearly maintaining what His Grace has quoted Usher as holding, namely, "that the spiritual grace of Baptism, 'a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness,' is only received where there has been an antecedent act of grace on the part of God?" I have added elsewhere other passages from Usher,† but I need not here quote any more proofs of his doctrine.

* Letter 23. Parr's Life, pp. 50, 51.
† Effects of Infant Baptism, 1st ed. p. 310 et seq.; 2d ed. p. 343 et seq.

There is, however, one remark in what he has written on this point which I would earnestly commend to your Lordship's notice. You speak of "the illustrious name of Usher" (p. 31). You will not doubt his profound erudition, or the value of his judgment on theological questions. Hear then, my Lord, the modest language in which this profound theologian speaks to a brother theologian, Dr. Ward, on the subject, and judge of the estimate he would have formed of the course you are now pursuing.

"You have done me," he says, "a great pleasure in communicating unto me my Lord of Salisbury's and your own determination, touching *the efficacy of Baptism in infants*, for it is AN OBSCURE POINT, and such as I desire to be taught in by such as you are, rather than deliver mine own opinion thereof."*

So spoke Usher in 1630, when Archbishop of Armagh, to his friend Dr. Ward. What a contrast does the language of this profoundly learned prelate present to that with which the Church is now echoing! But the emptiest vessels make the loudest noise.

Before I pass on to the next witness, I cannot help quoting Usher's testimony to what was the view then *commonly received*, which occurs in the very next sentence to that which I have just quoted. Speaking of Bishop Downham's work on Perseverance (in which he strongly insists upon what is called the Calvinistic view of the effects of Baptism, and expressly interprets the Baptismal Service on the hypothetical principle),† he says,—"He there determineth that point of the efficacy of Baptism far otherwise than you do, *accommodating himself to the opinion more vulgarly received among us.*"

My Lord, I think you will be cautious how you again direct attention to Usher.

"Turn we to your third witness," adds your Lordship, "another very illustrious name, Bishop Jeremy Taylor . . . he shall be proved to bear testimony directly against you." And

* Letter 159. Parr's Life, p. 434.

† Given in my Work on the Effects of Infant Baptism, 1st ed. p. 306 et seq.; 2d ed. p. 338.

after accusing His Grace of citing a writer "as authority for a statement which he contradicts," and reading him a lecture upon the duty of greater caution in such a matter, you add these words,—"Your citation of Bishop Taylor, which you have so unsuspiciously received, is *absolutely and palpably fraudulent.*"

My Lord, on which side lies the "absolute and palpable fraudulence"—they are *your own words,* not mine—shall very soon be proved. And *you know* that the whole context, including the few words you quote, (and which you charge the Archbishop's "informant" with keeping out of sight), together with much more, was placed *in extenso* before the Court of Arches by Mr. Gorham's Advocate, and was before His Grace when he wrote, but doubtless not considered to require reproduction as a whole.

I give the passage as it was placed before the Court of Arches by Mr. Gorham's Advocate, and under your Lordship's eye in his published speech, and then all can judge, to whom belongs the charge of "absolute and palpable fraudulence;" and I willingly leave to the right owner, without qualification or abatement, the name you have chosen.

"When the ordinary effect of a Sacrament is done already by some other efficiency or instrument, yet the Sacrament is still as obligatory as before: not for so many reasons or necessities; but for the same commandment. Baptism is the first ordinary current in which the Spirit moves and descends upon us; and where God's Spirit is, they are the sons of God; for *Christ's Spirit descends upon* NONE BUT THEM THAT ARE HIS; and yet Cornelius, who had received the Holy Spirit, and was heard by God, and visited by an angel, and accepted in his alms and fastings and prayers, was tied to the susception of Baptism. To which may be added, that the receiving the effects of Baptism beforehand, was used as an argument the rather to administer Baptism. The effect of which consideration is this—that Baptism and its effect may be separated, and do not always go in conjunction; the effect may be before, and therefore much rather may it be after its susception, the Sacrament operating in the virtue of Christ, '*even as the Spirit shall move;*' according to that saying of St. Austin, 'The

work of regeneration that is begun in the ministry of Baptism, is perfected in some sooner, in some later;' and St. Bernard, 'We may soon be washed; but to be healed is a work of a long cure.'" ——"The Church gives the Sacrament, God gives the grace of the Sacrament. But because he *does not always give it at the instant in which the Church gives the Sacrament* (as if there be a secret impediment in the suscipient), and yet afterwards does give it when the impediment is removed (as to them that repent of that impediment), it follows that the Church may administer rightly, even *before God gives the real grace of the Sacrament;* and if God gives this grace afterwards by parts, and yet all of it is the effect of that covenant which was consigned in Baptism, he that defers some *may defer all,* and verify every part, as well as any part. For it is certain that in the instance now made, *all the grace is deferred;* IN INFANTS IT IS NOT CERTAIN BUT THAT SOME IS COLLATED OR INFUSED; however, *be it so or no,* yet upon this account the administration of the Sacrament is not hindered." (Works, ed. Heber, vol. 2. pp. 248 & 253.)

Is it possible, my Lord, that words could be used more completely justifying Mr. Gorham's view? Mr. Gorham holds that spiritual regeneration may be given before, or in, or after Baptism; and that it is never given *by virtue of Baptism*; and consequently that if the rite is effectual for making over this privilege at the moment of Baptism, there must have been a prævenient act of Divine grace towards the child, which nevertheless may take place at the very period of Baptism. Now what does Bishop Taylor say? He expressly maintains in this passage, that the grace of the Sacrament, which is regeneration, may be given before, or in, or after Baptism. He says expressly of the case of infants, in direct opposition to what your Lordship is contending for, that "in infants it is *not certain but that* some [grace] is collated or infused; however, *be it so or no,* yet," &c. He, however, himself thinks that "Baptism is the first *ordinary* current in which the Spirit moves and descends upon us," but *only* in the cases of those who *are Christ's*; for he immediately adds, "Christ's Spirit descends upon none but them that *are his;*" which is only another mode of expressing Mr. Gorham's view.

My Lord, what object, think you, can be accomplished by your thus exposing yourself in the face of the Church? But alas! to such consequences do steps taken in the spirit in which your Lordship met Mr. Gorham in his application for institution, usually lead.

Moreover, as to this witness also, I ask your Lordship how you have reconciled it to your conscience to pass over all the other passages opposed to your views which have been placed before you from Bishop Taylor, in a work from which you yourself quote, and to which, therefore, I may fairly refer?

For instance, take the following passage, given fully in my Work,* but, of necessity, more briefly here,—

"Although, by the present custom of the Church, we are baptized in our infancy, and do not actually reap that fruit of present pardon which persons of a mature age in the Primitive Church did . . . yet we must remember that there is *a baptism of the Spirit as well as of water:* and whenever this happens, *whether it be together with that baptism of water*, as usually it was *when only men and women of years of discretion were baptized;* or *whether it be ministered in the rite of confirmation . . . or that lastly, it be performed by an internal and merely spiritual ministry*, when we, by acts of our own election, verify the promise made in Baptism, and so *bring back the rite, by receiving the effect of Baptism;* that is, whenever the 'filth of our flesh is washed away,' and that we have 'the answer of a pure conscience towards God,' *which St. Peter affirms to be the true baptism* . . . then let us look to our standing," &c. (Life of Christ, Part 2. §. 12. disc. 9.)

Or the following, given in the same place;—

"Our hearers make use of sermons and discourses evangelical but to fill up void spaces of their time . . . The reason of this is a sad condemnation to such persons; they have not yet entertained the Spirit of God, they are in darkness; *they were washed in water, but never baptized with the Spirit;* for those things are spiritually discerned." (Serm. 1. for Whitsunday.)

To use your own words, then, (though uttered by you in

* Effects of Infant Baptism, pp. 446, 447; or, 2d ed. pp. 486, 487.

sarcasm) "these *are*," and are likely to *remain*, notwithstanding your vain attempts to discredit the reference to them, His Grace's "witnesses, a sample of the 'many divines' of our Church" who have advocated the view which they are cited by him as maintaining.

And before I pass on, I would ask your Lordship, what you suppose to be the feelings of the unprejudiced portion of the Church, as to the testimonies that have been placed before it, respecting the doctrines formerly entertained on this subject by various *other* of its most eminent prelates and divines. For a long period after the Reformation you have not a single witness that you can lean upon in our Church. And even when the current tone of theology among us began to change, in Laud's time, so entirely different were even Laud's views from those of your Lordship, as to the character of such doctrine as that of Mr. Gorham, that he not only made no opposition to the promotion in the Church of men holding it, but actually recommended them for the Episcopal office.

Thus Bishop Prideaux, who, after filling the Regius Divinity Professor's chair at Oxford for a quarter of a century, was consecrated by him to the bishopric of Worcester, had taught publicly at Oxford, and in print, that the language respecting regeneration in the Baptismal Service was only *the language of charity* (ex charitate Ecclesiæ), and had delivered precisely the same doctrine as that of Mr. Gorham.*

Thus, again, the apostolic Bishop Bedell, who was promoted to his See at the especial recommendation of Laud, advocates the same doctrine in his able and admirable Letters to Dr. Ward, to be found in Parr's Life of Usher.†

Are *you*, then, my Lord, to be permitted to brand such men as these with the stamp of heresy? Have we really got so far on the way to Rome, that Laud himself has been left in the distance, as a patronizer of heretics, as a friend to those who denied an Article of the Creed, because he supported men holding these views?

* I have given the passages in my work on the Effects of Infant Baptism, 1st ed. p. 258, 259; 2nd ed., p. 285.

† Reprinted ib. p. 318 et seq.; 2nd ed. p. 359 et seq.

My Lord, there is one advantage, I will admit, accruing from such an attempt. It reveals the real position which you and your party now occupy.

But to proceed with your Letter. Your Lordship next (p. 34) animadverts on the Archbishop's reference to Bullinger's Decades, in which he states that doctrine similar to that of Mr. Gorham was "at one time authoritatively taught in our Church; for it is uniformly laid down in the *Decades of Bullinger*, that 'in Baptism *that* is sealed and confirmed to infants, which they had before;' so that 'the first beginning of our uniting and fellowship with Christ is not wrought by the Sacraments.' And in the year 1586, it was ordered by the Queen and the Upper House of Convocation, that those Decades of Bullinger should be studied and taken as a model by every minister who had not passed the Master of Arts' degree."

And you remark first, "respecting Bullinger himself," that "the truth is, that Bullinger, as well as Calvin and others of their school, made two sorts of statements, which, taken in their plain meaning, *flatly contradict one another*," and that "our divines" "took those better passages in their plain meaning, and so quoted the writers as agreeing with the doctrine of the Church of England;" "overlooking" and "neglecting" the contradictory statements; "for, taken in their real meaning, those passages which" the Archbishop cites, "*really contradict the very Articles and Formularies which those divines established.*" (p. 34, 35.)

My Lord, when we read this charge of *flat self-contradiction* urged against such divines as Bullinger and Calvin, and your estimate of the wisdom and learning of our own greatest divines, Jewell, Parker, Whitgift, &c. &c. (who, it seems, could not see what sort of book Bullinger's Decades was,) we are involuntarily driven to ask, *Quis vituperavit?* who is the accuser? Because the world has been hitherto accustomed to think, that such men, whether right or wrong in their belief, were not the most likely to have laid themselves open to such accusations. And when we recollect how confidently, in your recent Charge, your Lordship (all unconscious of the heretical source from which you were quoting) cited the words of Calvin as decisively

delivering your own doctrine on the subject of Baptism,* we cannot help seeing how the hard "necessities of your position" (as Mr. Newman would say) left you only the alternative either of bringing this accusation, or of retracting a previous statement.

My Lord, I think it quite unnecessary to go into the question, whether Bullinger's statements are self-contradictory, though I entirely deny that they are so. I am quite satisfied with your Lordship's own admission, that the testimonies referred to by His Grace (a few out of many of the same kind), "really contradict the very Articles and Formularies" of our Church, that is to say, *your interpretation of their meaning*. I ask no better evidence, that the doctrine of Bullinger's Decades and that of your Lordship are entirely opposed to each other on the point in question. And your charge of self-contradiction entirely arises from your confounding such language as that which both Bullinger and Calvin unhesitatingly use (and in which Mr. Gorham would fully acquiesce) as to the efficacy of the Sacrament in cases that come within the provisions of the Covenant, with the Romish doctrine of its *opus operatum* efficacy.

Your endeavour to get over the fact of such a volume being set forth "for the better increase of learning in the inferior clergy"—of which they were to read a sermon every week, and make notes of it, and be afterwards examined in their notes,—by the supposition, that this was only from its being considered "in the main" "an useful manual," (p. 39, 40), though in some most essential points its statements "contradict the very Articles and Formularies" of our Church,—I leave to the reader's reflections.

Then comes the question, Was the doctrine of Bullinger's Decades "authoritatively taught in our Church?" This, it seems, your Lordship is prepared to deny. Let us compare this denial first with what your Lordship *admits* on the subject. You admit, that these "Orders" were "*agreed* upon by the Archbishops [read Archbishop] and Bishops," and that they were publicly read at the request of the Prolocutor before the Lower House. But you add,—"There is not a trace of

* "It is *impossible not to see* in these words," &c.

the consent of the Lower House having been given to the measure. No Canon, no *Act* whatever, relating to it, appears in the Acts of that Convocation. Therefore that this book was 'authoritatively taught' seems a mere gratuitous *dictum.*"

My Lord, the Order has never been cited as an Act of the *whole* Convocation, but only of "the Upper House;" and that you should consider "the *consent* of the Lower House," so necessary to the validity of such an "Order," that it could have no "authority" without it, is not a little surprising. Certainly the Lower House did not *itself* think its "consent" necessary, when it asked as a favor, by its Prolocutor, that the Orders should be *read* before it, and took no action on the subject. Has your Lordship forgotten your own reference, in your recent Charge,* to the Canons of 1571, agreed upon only by "the Upper House of Convocation," which you put together with the Canons of 1604, and call both "*high authorities,*" nay "THE LAWS OF THE CHURCH" (which, by the way, the Canons of 1571 certainly are not)? It seems, then, that when the Upper House of Convocation passed Orders or Canons agreeable to your Lordship's views, such Orders are "*the Laws of the Church,*" even though lacking the written sanction of the Crown, but when such Orders are opposed to your Lordship's doctrine, then you are wholly unprepared to admit that they have any authority at all!

And what is more extraordinary, though you admit that these "Orders" were "agreed upon by the Archbishop and Bishops" met in Convocation, you say, "as to any *order* made by the Bishops I am equally at a loss to find it." Permit me, my Lord, to ask you this question. If you published a set of "Orders for the discipline of the Church" (the title of those in question) in your Diocese, what would you think of any of your clergy who should plead in excuse for not attending to them, that you had issued no "Order" ordering these "Orders" to be followed?

And it so happens in this case, that the last "Order" does contain an "order" for their observance, for it runs thus,—

* pp. 25, 26.

"8. It is concluded, that the exercises above written, and no other, shall be henceforth publicly or privately used within any part of this Province."

You then tell us, that "it is not a light confirmation of the improbability that the book was ever 'authoritatively taught,' that it is one which is now of extreme rarity;" and add,—"The only copy I have been able to find is in English, printed in 1577; and I am assured by an excellent authority in such a matter, that no subsequent edition of it was published in England during that century. *None therefore at the time when the demand for the book, if your Grace's statement be correct, must have been greatest,* [your own italics]." (p. 41.)

My Lord, I stand perfectly amazed at the temerity of such statements, when made under the circumstances and with the views in which your Letter originated. The volume, though not of course a common book, is by no means of extreme rarity, and far less so than volumes of the same period which indisputably must have had the largest possible circulation among the clergy, as for instance the Bibles, the Prayer-books, the Articles, the Catechisms of that period. Bullinger's "Decads" was superseded by other works, and moreover fell of course into disrepute when the tone of the theology of our Church became changed, and few copies comparatively have remained to this period. But you say, that you have been "assured by an excellent authority" that no edition of it was published here after 1577. My Lord, (to say nothing of the "Typographical Antiquities" of Ames and Herbert, which any literary man would at once have consulted,) the commonest book upon such subjects, and one which it might be supposed could hardly be unknown to you, Watt's Bibliotheca, tells you that there were *two* English editions after this period, one of 1584, and another of 1587, and one in Latin in 1586. Copies of the edition of 1587 are not of unfrequent occurrence, and I myself possess one of them.

But His Grace has said also, that these "Orders" were issued under the Queen's authority as well as that of the Bishops; that is, that they had the Queen's sanction; and your Lordship tells us, that you have searched and "can

find no authority at all for the *Queen's* having had anything to do with such an Order." My Lord, success in a search depends much upon a willingness to find. Permit me to advise you to make inquiry at the office where the State Papers are kept, and you will there find the original copy of these "Orders" lodged with the Secretary of State in January 1586 (1587, *new style*), the month after they were agreed upon by the Bishops, and deposited there as a public State document, and endorsed "Orders for the Discipline of the Church." Will this satisfy your Lordship that they had the sanction, through its proper officers, of the Crown? or will you tell us that the Secretary of State carefully preserved among the public documents of the State a paper of Orders drawn up by the Bishops, to which the State had given no sanction? And it appears that this was one of those more important documents of which Sir Joseph Williamson, Secretary of State in the time of Charles II., had copies made for greater security.

And what adds to the evidence, is the fact, that on the title-page of the edition of 1587 are the words (*not to be found in the edition of* 1577) "Cum gratia et privilegio Regiæ Majestatis."

It is not here said, be it observed, that these "Orders" were Acts of Convocation, nor that they were authoritatively enforced by the Crown under the great seal. But that they were agreed to by the Upper House of Convocation, sanctioned by the Crown, and preserved as a State document, and then read in the Lower House of Convocation as Orders to be followed, has been clearly proved.

And so fully had these "Orders" been brought under the eye of the State, and sanctioned by it, that the Archbishop expected that *it would be inquired into in the following Parliament how they had been observed.* For we find in Strype a circular letter sent by the Archbishop to the Bishops of his Province, in Nov. 1588, in which these "Orders" are thus spoken of,—

"That whereas the 2nd of December, when they were assembled in the Synod kept in the year 1586, it was thought fit and necessary to him and the rest of his brethren then present in that Synod,

(although not as a judicial act or conclusion by the authority of the Convocation), that the Articles of the tenor of the copy therein inclosed should be put in execution by their Lordships and all the rest of his said brethren, the Bishops of this Province: *forasmuch as it was likely it would be looked for at this next Parliament, how the said Articles had been accordingly used* . . . . That these were heartily to pray their Lordships with all speed by their letters to certify him," &c. (Strype's Whitgift, bk. 3. c. 20. i. 531.)

One word more as to the doctrine of Bullinger's Decads "having been authoritatively taught in our Church" at this period, cannot, I suppose, be needed.

My Lord, when you next undertake to vilify and bring into contempt all the highest authorities, civil and ecclesiastical, under which God has placed you, will it be too much to ask you to make sure of your facts?

Your Lordship next proceeds to the consideration of citations made by His Grace to show that "*the principle of charitable presumption,*" which he applies to the interpretation of the language of our Formularies, has been recognized by several of our greatest divines, as that on which we ought to proceed when speaking of the state of baptized Christians. Your Lordship will have the kindness to mark *what was the object in view,* as clearly expressed by the Archbishop.

The first quotation is the following from Bishop Pearson. "When the means are used, without something appearing to the contrary, we presume the good effect." (Comm. on Creed, Art. Comm. of Saints.)

On this your Lordship exclaims, "He says it of *adults* . . . He says nothing of infants *here;* nothing of the effect of Baptism to them." I beg to ask where your Lordship picked up this piece of information. Are we to receive it upon your *ipse dixi?* Mark the position in which you leave Bishop Pearson;—that in a Church where all, with scarcely the exception of one in five thousand, receive Baptism in their infancy, he meant to limit what he said generally about baptized persons to those cases which *hardly ever occur!* Truly, a very reasonable hypothesis! But, my Lord, we shall find more to

our purpose in the *context* of these words. Allow me, therefore, to introduce it to your notice.

"For being baptism is a washing away of sin, and the purification from sin is a proper sanctification; being every one who is so called and baptized is thereby separated from the rest of the world which are not so, and all such *separation* is *some kind of sanctification;* being, though the work of grace be not perfectly wrought, yet when the means are used, *without something appearing to the contrary,* we ought to *presume* of the good effect; *therefore* all * such as have been received into the Church may be *in some sense* called holy. But because there is more than an outward vocation, and *a charitable presumption,* necessary to make a man holy, therefore we must find *some other qualification which must make him really and truly such,* not only by an *extrinsical denomination,* but by a *real and internal affection.* What this sanctity is, and who are capable of *this title properly,* we must learn out of the Gospel of Christ; by which alone, ever since the Church of Christ was founded, any man can become a Saint. Now, by the tenor of the Gospel, we shall find, that those are *truly and properly saints,* which are 'sanctified in Christ Jesus,' (1 Cor. i. 2.) First, in respect of THEIR HOLY FAITH BY WHICH THEY ARE REGENERATED; for, 'whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God' (1 John v. 1); by which they are *purged,* God himself 'purifying their hearts by faith' (Acts xv. 9), *whereby they 'are washed, sanctified, and justified,* in the name of the Lord Jesus' (1 Cor. vi. 11), 'in whom also, *after that they believe, they are sealed with the' Holy Spirit of promise.*' (Eph. i. 13.) Secondly, in respect of their conversation," &c.

Such, my Lord, is the help which Bishop Pearson gives you.

But you quote a passage from his "Determinations," which you tell His Grace is "absolutely inconsistent" with the notion for which the Archbishop cites him. Let us see. Your Lordship gives the passage thus,—

"Nothing in the whole compass of our religion is more sure

* According to your Lordship's interpretation, the "all" here would mean about one in five thousand.

than the exceeding great and most certain efficacy of Baptism to spiritual good; that it is an outward and visible sign indeed, but by it an invisible grace is signified; and the sign itself was instituted *for the very purpose that it should confer that grace.*"

No doubt it was; and that invisible grace is the state of spiritual regeneration as a child of God; which is formally made over by the rite of Baptism, and by that only. But *how* made over? Not by the *opus operatum* virtue of Baptism, but agreeably with the provisions of the Gospel Covenant, and therefore in the case of many infants, just as in the case of impenitent adults, only *conditionally* made over. And even where it is absolutely and at once made over, it is not made over by the *opus operatum* virtue of Baptism; so that though conferred instrumentally by Baptism, as an office is conferred upon a properly qualified person by the appointed form of admission to it, it is *never given* BY VIRTUE OF *Baptism itself.*

Your own admission, that it is not always conferred in the case of adults, wholly nullifies the argument you attempt to derive from such passages as this. Before you can make use of any such passages, you must take the ground that Baptism always produces this effect in the case of all *adults* as well as all infants, and then you are in open opposition to the Thirty-Nine Articles.

The next authority quoted by His Grace is Hooker, whom he cites as saying, "We speak of infants as the rule of charity alloweth." Here, no doubt, His Grace has inadvertently put the word "charity" instead of "piety." But the context most incontrovertibly shows, that Hooker's *meaning* has not been misrepresented. And I can assure your Lordship, that however "distressing" it may have been to you to deliver your criticisms upon His Grace's remarks, it is at least equally distressing to others to witness their tone and character. The passage from which these few words are taken has been, as your Lordship is aware, presented to the public in full with the foregoing and subsequent context, and precisely as it stands in Hooker, in connexion with this controversy.* And

* Effects of Infant Baptism, p. 336, 337; or, 2d ed. p. 369.

we could desire no other words, and no other context, than those of Hooker. In reply to Cartwright's objection (founded upon the old Service, where the child was supposed to make the answers), that "it can be no more precisely said that it hath faith, than it may be said precisely elected," Hooker says,—

"Were St. Augustine now living, there are which could tell him for his better instruction, that to say of a child, 'it is elect,' and to say it doth believe, are all one, for which cause, sith no man is able precisely to affirm the one of any infant in particular, it followeth that 'precisely' and 'absolutely' we ought not to say the other. *Which 'precise' and 'absolute' terms are needless in this case. We speak of infants as the rule of piety alloweth both to speak and think.* They that can take to themselves in ordinary talk a charitable kind of liberty to name men of their own sort God's dear children (notwithstanding the large reign of hypocrisy) should not methinks be so strict and rigorous against the Church for PRESUMING AS IT DOTH of a Christian innocent."

Here "the rule of piety" is put in contrast with the use of "precise and absolute terms," which shows, it might be supposed, tolerably plainly what was meant by the phrase. But if there was any doubt, the words that follow would remove it, when they speak of "the Church *presuming* AS IT DOTH of a Christian innocent." What is your Lordship's answer? Oh! all this is only an "*argumentum ad hominem.*" Hooker does not by any means intend to say, that the Church *does presume* as to the state of an infant (though he expressly says "*presuming,* AS IT DOTH"); he held that the terms used *are* precise and absolute. And he says all this only as an "*argumentum ad hominem*" against Cartwright! What! my Lord, this from one who flings his accusations of disingenuousness and fraud, and what not, recklessly over the land against all who maintain that our devotional Services are constructed upon the principle of charity! Hooker, when he says that the Church *does presume,* does *not* mean that it *does presume,* but is only using an *argumentum ad hominem!*

But in the next sentence we find your Lordship, with Protean agility, shifting your ground, for you there tell us, that *presumes* means *presumes* "*not merely charitably but* ABSOLUTELY."

That is, to "presume" does not mean here to "presume," but *to be certain of;* a piece of information which I hope your Lordship will communicate to the next Editor of Johnson's Dictionary, otherwise it will infallibly escape him.

But your Lordship has proofs from Hooker's own works that he did so. By all means let us hear them. The first is, that Hooker calls Sacraments "marks whereby to know when God doth impart the vital or saving grace of Christ *unto all that are capable* thereof."

What then, my Lord? The very question at issue is, Who are capable thereof? For Hooker is not here speaking of capability in the sense of *physical ability* for receiving grace, because he is speaking of *both* Sacraments and of the cases both of infants and adults. He is, of necessity, speaking of moral suitability, according to the terms of the Covenant, for receiving it.

As to the other passage, I know not how it can help your Lordship's cause. It runs thus,—

"Baptism, therefore, even in the meaning of the law of Christ, belongeth unto infants capable thereof from the very instant of their birth."

Does Mr. Gorham hold, my Lord, that Baptism does *not* belong to infants, or that they are *not* capable thereof?

I am glad, however, that your Lordship feels so much "refreshed" by "these noble statements of Catholic doctrine,"—first, that the Sacraments give grace to worthy recipients, and, secondly, that Baptism belongs to infants. And it is gratifying, after "distasteful work," to find something in which all can be "refreshed" together, though it be but with ordinary fare.

The next citation made by His Grace is from Bishop Carleton, and here you admit (p. 46) that "this is very apposite to the immediate purpose for which" His Grace "cites it." It would have been difficult, indeed, to have quarrelled with this, seeing that it is spoken with *express reference* to the Baptismal Service. Bishop Carleton expressly maintains that spiritual regeneration is not necessarily given to all infants in Baptism; which was the doctrine for maintaining which, your Lordship

refused institution to Mr. Gorham, according to your own recorded plea in the Courts of Law. But, from some cause or other, there has been a great change recently in the point of attack selected. We hear little now of anything but the remission of original sin to infants in Baptism. And accordingly, leaving the original question which you raised against Mr. Gorham, and in which Bishop Carleton is wholly against you, you take refuge in a statement of his respecting the remission of original sin to infants in Baptism, which you say is entirely opposed to Mr. Gorham's doctrine. Be it so, my Lord. Still, in the first place, this fact does not invalidate his testimony in favour of Mr. Gorham, and against your Lordship, in the great question you raised on the subject, and for which his testimony was adduced; and secondly, you must show, that he held that the children of parents not Christian are entitled to Baptism, before you can get much out of his words; and thirdly, as your Lordship dissents from him in one point, Mr. Gorham may in the other, and has a perfect right to maintain, in preference, the doctrine of the Apostolical Bishop Bedell, who held that the ablution of sin in Infant Baptism was only "conditional and expectative."

You proceed to His Grace's last testimony, which is, that "at the Savoy Conference" the Services of the Church "were defended against objections on this very ground."

To meet this, your Lordship adduces instances in which the Bishops at that Conference did *not* resort to that mode of interpretation. But this, I need hardly remind you, proves nothing. The question is, whether they were not compelled to adopt this mode of interpretation with respect to some parts of the Services. And it is undeniable that they were compelled to do so.* And consequently, we have a method of interpretation placed before us supported by their testimony, which *we* may justly apply to *other parts* besides those to which *they* chose to apply it. Their testimony is referred to as establishing *the principle,* not as binding us to use it precisely as they used it.

My Lord, I have now gone through that portion of your

* I have shown this in my Work, already referred to, pp. 390, 391; or, 2d ed. pp. 426, 427.

Letter which refers to the statements of His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. And I would ask you calmly to look back, and review the result of this examination of the charges you have brought against him. In the whole annals of the Church, it would be difficult to find a parallel for such an outbreak on the part of a provincial Bishop against his Metropolitan. The terms of insult and reproach with which you—you who are calling for almost abject submission to your will from those placed under your own Episcopal superintendence—have here addressed your Ecclesiastical superior, are such as, even in the heat of controversy, men hesitate to use towards those to whom they owe no obedience, no deference.

You have charged him with "now, in his advanced years and exalted station, materially impairing, and almost contradicting, the sounder teaching of his earlier years," and with *the falsehood* of speaking of a work as if it was substantially the same, though there had been introduced into it "most important changes." What have we found to be the case? That what you charge upon him as "most important changes," first published in 1850, "almost contradicting the sounder teaching of his earlier years," have formed part of the work ever since the year 1817.

You have arraigned him publicly before the Church as a teacher of "*heresy*," "*rank Popery and worse than Popery.*" (pp. 13, 14.) And we find that the charge is grounded upon a direct and palpable mis-statement of his doctrine. And you betray your capabilities for the office of His Grace's censor, by directing him to a Canon, as one of the Canons of the Code of the Universal Church, which you ought to have known has no place there, and as sanctioned by a Council which probably never heard of it. You misquote Scripture itself (p. 15) to make out your case, and send His Grace to an Article of the Nicene Creed which no more establishes your doctrine than the first chapter of Genesis.

You charge upon him that, "instead of leading, he has misled those whom he was to instruct, not only by mis-stating the matters on which he advised, but also by *misquoting all, or almost all, the authors cited by him* (p. 25); that he has "concurred in *a false and destructive declaration,*" and, "as far as in

him lies," "sanctioned a decision that the Church over which he presides is *no part of the Church of Christ,*" and "*done all which a declaration of his could do to cut off the Church in which he occupies the highest place, from communion with the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of all ages,*" &c. (pp. 26, 27.)

And what do we find? That one and all of the citations made by His Grace are strictly applicable for the purpose for which he quotes them, and fully bear him out in the inferences he has deduced from them; and that your haughty and self-sufficient denunciations of your Primate, for maintaining Mr. Gorham's doctrine to be thoroughly consistent with an honest adherence to the Articles and Formularies of our Church and of the true Catholic Church, are entirely opposed to the testimony of a host of the best, and wisest, and most learned men our Church has ever produced. For, be it remembered, the citations we have been considering, are only a few *which His Grace happened to select,* out of a multitude that had been brought before the public, of a similar kind.

My Lord, you have yourself admitted (p. 27), that if you fail to establish your charges, you will have "fastened on yourself the guilt not only of calumny, but of schism." I leave it then to the public to determine in what position you now stand.

Your Lordship proceeds to a consideration of *the Judgment* of the Judicial Committee, and you commence your review of it by a statement of what you are pleased to call "the two chief heresies of Mr. Gorham." (pp. 48—52.)

This statement I have already met, and shown what are the real points at issue. I therefore proceed at once to your remarks on *the Judgment;* only premising, that almost all the difficulties you have contrived to raise against it, proceed, first, from your unwarranted *assumptions,* and, secondly, from your straining the language of Mr. Gorham, directed only against your unsound doctrine of the *opus operatum* efficacy of Baptism, as if it denied all efficacy to Baptism. You commence thus,—

"The heresy which I first named, that original sin is stated by Mr. Gorham to be a hindrance to the right reception of Baptism, instead of being remitted by it, is only noticed in the Judgment in

these terms :—'That in no case is regeneration in Baptism unconditional;' and 'What is signified by *right reception* is not determined by the Articles. Mr. Gorham says, that the expression always means or implies a fit state to receive,—viz. in the case of adults, *with faith and repentance*, and in the case of infants, *with God's grace and favor*.'"

And you then exclaim, "'With God's grace and favour,' my Lord? Who can deny this?" And you complain that these words are not Mr. Gorham's, for *he* used the phrase "an act of prævenient grace;" and you then inform the Judges, that "each infant brought to Baptism" comes with God's grace and favor, for which you quote passages of the Prayer Book, which of course every body is bound to understand in the sense you affix to them, or be at once branded as a heretic.

My Lord, there are so many observations suggested by this passage, that it is difficult to know with which to begin. In the first place, the Judges have taken up the case precisely as you yourself presented it to their notice. Your charge against Mr. Gorham was, that he "held, and persisted in holding, that spiritual regeneration is not given or conferred in" Baptism, and that "Infants are not made therein members of Christ and the children of God."

To this point, therefore, more especially, they directed their attention. And the specific charge as to the "remission of the guilt of original sin," has been an after-thought upon which you have fallen back when defeated in your great object; and you are now raising an unjust clamour against your Judges, as if the point you had brought under their notice had not been properly considered by them. My Lord, the artifice will not avail you. The terms of your accusation against Mr. Gorham, as laid before the Judges, are *well known to the public*, and your accusation has been dealt with *as made*,—not, of course, as it is *now* put forth by you, cobbled and re-furbished.

Your Lordship complains, that the Judges have not rightly stated Mr. Gorham's views, when they represent them as being, that infants, in order to receive at the moment of Baptism the full baptismal blessing, must come "with God's grace and favor," for that Mr. Gorham's phrase is, "an act of prævenient grace." A very nice distinction this, my Lord! Where there

is "God's grace and favor," *there*, certainly, there has been "an act of God's grace." So that when infants come to Baptism "with God's grace and favor," there has been "an act of prævenient grace." There may be something of a scholastic rigidity in Mr. Gorham's phrase, but the meaning is just what is here expressed in the Judgment.

But you add, that doubtless they *must* come "with God's grace and favor;" and you declare that they do ALL come with it. Why then, my Lord, the only difference between you and Mr. Gorham is this, that *he* holds that *some* infants only come to Baptism after an act of prævenient grace, and *you* hold that they *all* come with prævenient grace. You have here, my Lord, with your own hands, torn up your own doctrine by the very roots. For in consistency with your doctrine you ought to have maintained, that Divine grace and favor are not given till the moment that you sprinkle and baptize them. A more awkward slip it would be difficult to conceive. And your apology for "common-law judges" "not understanding theological statements" is very kind, but here, at least, not needed; for it is your Lordship that has slipped, and not the Judges. It is really difficult to find out what your Lordship *does* hold. At one time you protest against any infant being supposed to have an interest in God's favor until it is baptized, and leave it till Baptism under the full weight of the guilt of original sin; *now* you say, all infants come to Baptism "with God's grace and favor." And you ask, "Who can deny this?" Why you yourself, my Lord. The very essence of your doctrine, as hitherto stated, has been, that God's grace and favor was given through the Baptismal act, and *not till then*. What *is* your doctrine, my Lord? Are you sure that you yourself know what it is? For you cannot consistently hold *both* these views at the same time.

It is impossible not to observe here, how important it is to the cause of truth and justice, that the determination of such a cause as that between your Lordship and Mr. Gorham, should rest chiefly with those who, from their habits, and acquirements, and tone of mind, are able to take a simple, and impartial, and *judicial* view of the subject. The question to be

determined was one in which legal knowledge and judicial experience were absolutely necessary to secure a fair sentence. And I think we can hardly over-estimate the value of such a check upon the inroads, which the individual feelings and opinions of dominant parties in the Church tend to produce upon its primitive faith, by pretended interpretations of it.

Your Lordship complains, that no especial notice has here been taken of the question as to the remission of original sin. Who is in fault, my Lord, for this? The Judges or yourself? If you had put it forward, doubtless they would have expressly noticed it. And your charge against them of substituting one set of words for another, when they have most correctly expressed Mr. Gorham's view, and of meeting an accusation different from that which was really brought, can only injure yourself. Can you suppose that such a charge, when brought against five Judges of the highest legal and social reputation, can have any other effect than to recoil upon him who makes it?

But that their statements, both here and elsewhere, *include* in them a justification of Mr. Gorham's view on the point which you *now* raise, as well as the other which you raised in your formal charge against him, is manifest. And this is all you were entitled to expect, from the way in which that charge was framed. *They*, my Lord, unbiassed by theological prejudices and desires to uphold a system, could clearly see, that if infants come to Baptism "with God's grace and favor," they do not come under the full weight of unpardoned original sin, though that pardon may not be formally made over to them but by the rite of Baptism; and consequently that there has been, from some cause or other, an enjoyment of prævenient grace and favor, such as we cannot maintain that all infants of necessity partake of; and that if they come under the weight of that original sin that (our Church tells us) "deserves God's wrath and damnation," we are contradicting ourselves in saying, that they are in the possession of God's grace and favor, or even in a state which necessarily calls for the Divine grace and favor in Baptism. You must not expect that old and experienced Judges, unfettered by theological systems and crotchets, will permit themselves to be led away by palpable self-contradic-

tions. If you tell them, that every infant enjoys "God's grace and favor," they will tell your Lordship that you must give up the doctrine, that every infant lies by nature under the guilt of sin that deserves God's wrath and damnation. And if they find you endeavouring to compel the minister of a Church that holds the latter doctrine, to maintain your self-contradictions on the subject, they will protect him from such an attempt. And if, further, they find you maintaining (as in consistency with your avowed doctrine you ought to have maintained) that you can give God's grace, and favor, and remission of sins to every infant, though before destitute of it, and requiring your clergy to subscribe to this doctrine, they will take the liberty of examining your claims to this prerogative, and ascertaining whether the Church of which you are a minister recognises such claims.

You have, in fact, expressly and in terms, contradicted yourself in this matter within four pages hence in this very Letter. For while you say here, in p. 53, "Who can deny," that infants have "God's grace and favour" when "*brought to Baptism*;" in p. 57, speaking of "grace," you say,—"which infants, before Baptism, have not, 'being by nature children of wrath.'"

Your Lordship proceeds (p. 54 et seq.) to what you call "the other class of false doctrine," held by Mr. Gorham, namely, that contained in your second charge against him, given p. 22 above. And you again complain, that his doctrine on this subject has not been fairly represented by the Judicial Committee, and spend five pages in criticising their statement of it. My Lord, the only reply necessary to all your remarks in these five pages is contained in the observations already made upon your representation of Mr. Gorham's views. The account of Mr. Gorham's doctrine, given in the Judgment, is a fair, temperate, and accurate statement of his views, derived from an impartial survey of his answers to your Questions, with only a proper allowance for (as the Judgment itself expresses it) "the general scope, object, and character of *the whole* EXAMINATION."

You complain, that while the Judgment states that Mr. Gorham "supposes that the grace of regeneration does not

invariably take place in Baptism," his own doctrine is, that it *never* takes place in Baptism, because he says that infants "must have been regenerated by an act of grace prævenient to Baptism, in order to make them worthy recipients of that Sacrament." But, in the first place, you are met here by Mr. Gorham's explicit disavowal in both Courts, that he *did* maintain "that spiritual regeneration is not given or conferred in the holy Sacrament of Baptism, or that infants are not made therein members of Christ and the children of God." It was clear therefore at once, that your Lordship and Mr. Gorham were using similar words in different senses. And it was impossible to do justice to Mr. Gorham, without considering the purport and object of *your Questions*, and judging of the answers accordingly. Your evident object was, to drive Mr. Gorham to the admission of your doctrine of the *opus operatum* efficacy of Baptism; and the consequence was, that the more you strove to effect that, the more cautious was Mr. Gorham in using words which you could misinterpret as implying that doctrine. Keen and experienced Judges, accustomed to deal with such matters, of course saw this, and took it into account in their estimate of Mr. Gorham's views. Regeneration may be conferred previous to Baptism by a Divine grant, and yet be conferred in and by Baptism as the rite for formally making over that grant. You hardly seem prepared to deny this yourself in the case of adults, and at any rate we have good authority for saying that it is so in their case. There is no self-contradiction, therefore, at least, in the statement, when applied to the case of infants. And Mr. Gorham has from the first declared in both Courts, that he does not deny that spiritual regeneration is given in Baptism.

It is not true, therefore, that his statements about regeneration and adoption being given before the administration of the Sacrament, have been "ignored" by the Judicial Committee, as you charge them with doing (pp. 56, 57). Those statements have been fully taken into account, but they have been interpreted in their *right sense*, which your Lordship refuses to see, because nothing will satisfy you but the admission of your *opus operatum* doctrine. And from the nature of

the subject, and the opportunity it affords for dialectical manœuvring, you find no difficulty in throwing dust into the eyes of the public as to the real question at issue. The Judicial Committee were not to be so misled.

The Judgment says, that Mr. Gorham holds "That Baptism is an effectual sign of grace, by which God works invisibly in us, but only in such as worthily receive it; in them alone it has a wholesome effect."

"This," you say, "is of course true in itself, being, in fact, the words of different parts of Art. 25;" but only (you intimate) "as to adults." But this limitation of the meaning of the words merely rests on your unsupported assertion. And you say that your examination had no reference to them, "since adults are but seldom baptized now." And yet you suppose, that at a period when adults were even less frequently baptized than they are now, and such an occurrence was so rare that there was not even any Service appointed for such an occasion, the authors of our Articles, when laying down the doctrine of the Sacrament, spoke of the case of *adults only*, without any reference to that of infants! We see again, here, the value of the penetration and impartial eye of lawyers—I might say, of common sense—in determining the disputes of theologians.

You add,—"But the Judgment again ignored the fact, that the only graces which Mr. Gorham supposes God to 'work invisibly' in Baptism, are graces which, according to our Church, infants cannot have." There was a good reason, my Lord, for ignoring it, for it is *not* a "fact." Mr. Gorham (Ans. 38), says generally, that in Baptism worthily received, God "increases *the grace* which he had previously given us." And your objection to the applicability of this to infants, because "infants before Baptism have not" grace, "'being by nature children of wrath,'" is derived merely from your own doctrine that no children can partake in any way of God's grace until they are baptized, which involves the very question at issue. Mr. Gorham holds that infants may be partakers of Divine grace before Baptism, and that from their being all "by nature children of wrath," it is *necessary* that they should be par-

takers of it to make the mere act of Baptism effectual, at the moment, for the purpose for which it was intended, that is, for formally making over to them the state of regeneration and adoption; the mere *opus operatum* of Baptism having no power to effect this. And we have already seen the inconsistency of your Lordship on this point, for we have got through only four pages since we heard your Lordship exclaiming, "Who can deny," that it is necessary for infants *brought to* Baptism, to have "God's grace and favour," that they may receive benefit from the rite?

When, therefore, you complain of the Judgment "omitting to state, that Mr. Gorham supposes God to work by it what our Church says infants have not or cannot have, and denies that He works *then* what our Church teaches that He *then always* works," and add, "This, again, may be very natural in common-law Judges: I regret that it escaped your Grace"—you are only adding another proof, how much better fitted "common-law Judges" may be, to decide such a question as that involved in Mr. Gorham's case, than a theological partisan. Our Church maintains no such doctrine as that unbaptized infants have not God's grace. In fact, you have contradicted yourself on this point. And Mr. Gorham does *not* deny, that God works in Baptism what our Church teaches that He works therein.

The Judgment adds, in its description of Mr. Gorham's doctrine,—"And that without reference to the qualification of the recipient, it is not in itself an effectual sign of grace."

Upon this you observe,—"Most true, as it has ever been held by the whole Catholic Church, and must be held, of all those *capable* [your own italics] of 'qualification.'" (p. 58.)

My Lord, are infants *incapable* of qualification? *incapable* of receiving God's grace? *incapable* of having a grant of regeneration made to them, to be *afterwards* sealed and formally made over to them before the Church in Baptism? If they are not, on account of their infantine state, *capable* of this, they are not capable of receiving it in Baptism. If therefore you have proved anything, you have proved too much. But *capable* they certainly are; and if, in order to receive the baptismal blessing, all must be previously qualified who are capable of qualification, then

infants, who all by nature lie under the wrath of God, need qualification, suited to their years, as much as adults. You may think (and adduce great names in favour of the notion), that as they cannot have faith and repentance, and cannot sinfully oppose the influence of Divine grace upon them, they require no qualification. But that they are *capable* of it, is undeniable; and the qualification is maintained to be, that, instead of coming in their natural state, under God's wrath, they come enjoying his "grace and favor." Whether this may arise from birth of a Christian parent, or requires the grace of election or an internal work of grace upon the will and affections, or may be otherwise produced, is a different question, and one which I do not here stop to discuss. But that all infants necessarily possess that grace and favor, is a notion entirely opposed to the doctrine of our Church that all infants are by nature children of wrath.

You proceed,—

"And then, at last, mention is made in the Judgment of that upon which the whole does turn—the case of infants."

My Lord, this is entirely a misstatement; and you are again contradicting yourself in making it, for you yourself have been dealing with the whole account of Mr. Gorham's doctrine given in the Judgment, as given with reference to the case of infants, and endeavouring to prove, that though part of the doctrine there described may be true in the case of adults, it does not apply to the case of infants.

The Judgment concludes its description of Mr. Gorham's doctrine with the words,—"But in no case is regeneration in Baptism unconditional." Upon which you remark that,—

"In this statement, meagre as it is, Mr. Gorham's special error is not simply omitted; it is, by implication, denied. The Judgment states Mr. Gorham's doctrine 'in no case is regeneration *in* Baptism unconditional.' Mr. Gorham's doctrine is, in no case is regeneration *in* Baptism, but when Baptism is rightly received, *before it*." (p. 58.)

The remarks already made may show your Lordship, that you have here entirely misrepresented the matter. Mr. Gorham has in both Courts distinctly disavowed the doctrine which you thus

impute to him; and I need not here repeat what I have already said on this subject.

Having thus concluded your criticism upon the representation of Mr. Gorham's doctrine given in the Judgment, you denounce a Sentence drawn up by five of the most eminent Judges of the land, and sanctioned by the two Primates, in the following words,—

"So much *suppression of the truth* converts a formal absolution of Mr. Gorham into a virtual condemnation of his doctrine. Grave charges thus *glossed over* are tacitly acknowledged, while the individual is acquitted. My Lord, *truth does not usually thus shun the light.*" (p. 59.)

My Lord, on which side has been "suppression of the truth," a resort to the expedient of "glossing over," and a "shunning of the light," is, I trust, tolerably clear from what has been just stated. And it may not be unworthy of your consideration, on a future occasion, before you hurl your reproaches against such individuals as are responsible for this Judgment, how far your accusation is likely to have weight with the public mind. Otherwise your censures may return in tenfold force upon your own head.

My Lord, I have now gone through the most important part of your Letter to the Archbishop. The rest consists of vehement accusations of the Judicial Committee for omitting to notice what you are pleased to think authorities and arguments which they *ought* to have noticed, and taking a different view from that entertained by yourself of the authorities they *do* mention. This you think unpardonable.—Their cause might safely be left with the public. It may not, however, be improper, or without its use, for me to examine very briefly the grounds upon which you bring these charges against them, especially as some of your remarks refer to points which have been already in controversy between us, and with language towards myself which—while I will not pretend to expect any injury from it, considering the quarter from which it comes,—demands some notice of the points at issue.

You first complain, that they have omitted to notice "two main laws," the 57th Canon of 1604, and the Act of Uni-

formity,—which you tell them (in the plenitude of your superior knowledge both of law and divinity) "have the most direct, palpable, aye *conclusive* bearing on the matter in issue." (p. 59.) But before going into particulars as to the nature of those laws, you turn aside to call in question their mode of dealing with the XXXIX Articles. I must follow your course.

You say, that, in "examining the Articles, the Court does not apply itself to a consideration of the terms in which they are expressed, but does little more than institute a comparison between them and the Articles of 1536, and King Henry VIII.'s Book entitled 'Necessary Doctrine;'" and then complain, that this was not the proper way to ascertain the meaning of the Articles; that the Judicial Committee have been "caught by the sound of 'Articles of 1536,'" and "*jumped to the conclusion* that this was the document" by which to ascertain the meaning of what was doubtful in the Articles of 1552 and 1562, and "*assumed*" that "the Articles of 1536 were the foundation of those of the latter date;" and you "express your astonishment" that His Grace did not set them right in this matter.

My Lord, in "jumping to conclusions" you leave the Judicial Committee no chance of competing with you. Indeed they are satisfied, as it seems to me, with sober walking, step by step. But your leaps are terrific; you rise in one direction and descend in another; and though you come down where we expected, it is a marvel how you found your way there.

The Judicial Committee have done nothing of what you here charge them with doing, and *have* done what you charge them with omitting to do. They have expressly stated, in the most decisive terms, that they have grounded their Judgment upon an examination of the Articles and Formularies themselves, interpreted by the "old-established rules of construction." They say,—

"This question must be decided by the Articles and Liturgy, and *we must apply to the construction of those books the same rules which have long been established, and are by the law applicable to the construction of all written instruments.* We must endeavour to attain for ourselves the true meaning of the language employed, assisted only by the consideration of such external or historical facts as we

may find necessary to enable us to understand the subject-matter to which the instruments relate, and the meaning of the words employed. In our endeavours to ascertain the true meaning and effect of the Articles, Formularies, and Rubrics, we must by no means intentionally *swerve from the old-established rules of construction*, or depart from the principles which have received the sanction and approbation of the most learned persons in time past, as being, on the whole, the best calculated to determine the true meaning of the documents to be examined."

Can words be clearer to show the principle upon which they proceeded? Their comparison of the Articles of 1552 and 1562 with the Articles of 1536, was made merely to bring out this point, that in the latter document it was expressly *determined*, "1. That baptized infants dying before the commission of actual sin were undoubtedly saved *thereby* [which was also affirmed in the *Necessary Doctrine*]. 2. That unbaptized infants were not saved:"—while "the Articles of 1552 and 1562 say nothing expressly upon either point; but, not distinguishing the case of infants from that of adults, state in general terms, that those who receive Baptism rightly have the benefits there mentioned conferred." You say that the Articles of 1536 * were made *alio intuitu*, and for the people generally. And this is true, but will not aid you. For though they were addressed to the public generally, yet they were put forth also as *a guide to the clergy as to what doctrine they were to preach to the people;* for the different Articles commence in this way,—"Secondly" or "Thirdly," &c. "We will that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people .. that," &c. So that they are a similar document to the later Articles. Moreover, in whatever light we view them, they represent the doctrine of the authorities of our Church at that period; and if the doctrine required to be taught by public authority had remained the same when the Articles of 1552 and 1562 were published, these latter Articles would have similarly maintained it.

And the change is of no little importance, because one great

* Their proper title is,—"Articles devised by the Kinges Highnes Majestie, to stablyshe Christen quietnes and unitie amonge us, and to avoyde contentious opinions: which Articles be also approved by the consent and determination of the hole clergie of this realme." See Burton's reprint in "Formul. of Faith."

charge against Mr. Gorham was, that though he agreed with the Rubric that children baptized, dying before the commission of sin, were saved, he did not hold (as, it was said, he ought) that their salvation was to be ascribed to their Baptism.

The fact of the change as to the doctrine of the non-salvation of unbaptized infants, is expressly proved by the language of the "Reformatio Legum," drawn up under Cranmer's superintendence, and which received his sanction.* And it is admitted by Archbishop Laurence himself.†

But beyond the notice of this difference in the public documents of the two periods in illustration of this point, (which is so clear and marked a proof of the change in the theology of those periods, as to have obtained a strong testimony to its force from two of the leaders of your Lordship's party‡) no further reference is made to the Articles of 1536 and the "Necessary Doctrine."

The Court *has* "applied itself to a consideration of the terms" of the Articles, and has found that "the Articles of 1552 and 1562" "have special regard to the qualifications of worthy and right reception;" and that "the 25th Article of 1562 distinctly states, that in such only as worthily receive the same, the Sacraments have a wholesome effect or operation." And this the Court rightly considered as going to the root of the question between your Lordship and Mr. Gorham, rejecting your unsupported assertion that this applies only to adults. Moreover, as to the Articles, it had been admitted by the lower Court, that Mr. Gorham's doctrine was not opposed to *them*. On this point, therefore, it was less necessary to enlarge in the Court of Appeal. *Here* you have *both* Courts against you.

But you tell them, that the words of the Articles "have reference to the words of other Confessions of faith of other reformed communions, especially of the Confession of Augsburgh;" and that "to these Confessions of faith" "attention ought to have been given in the first instance, in order to interpret what may be doubtful in the language of our Articles." Her Majesty's Judges,

* I have given the passage in "Effects of Infant Baptism," pp. 188, 189; 2nd Ed. pp. 206, 207.

† Bampton Lect. pp. 70, 71.

‡ See Appendix to Mr. Dodsworth's Sermon, entitled "A house divided against itself," and Mr. Maskell's "Second Letter, &c." p. 17.

my Lord, must no doubt feel greatly indebted to you for the numerous instructions you have given them in this Letter for the right performance of their duties. But I suspect they will be inclined to prefer their own mode of proceeding, as stated in the words I have just quoted from the Judgment. This, however, I am sure of, that if they had acted upon the advice you have here given them, you would have been one of the first to cry out, and to complain of their going to the Confessions of other Churches to interpret the words of our own. And you talk of the Confessions of "other Reformed communions." I should have thought former experience had been sufficient to warn you of the danger of such a reference. Does your Lordship really think, that an interpretation of the language of our Articles by that of "other Reformed communions" would be of advantage to your cause? Surely we can only see here further evidence of that singular want of acquaintance with them, manifested so inopportunely on a former occasion.

But it seems that the great point to be brought out is, that our 25th Article, while it adopts words very similar to those of the Confession of Augsburgh, *adds* what you call "a clause which expresses the special, the essential, the distinctive characteristics of Catholic teaching on this point," namely, that Sacraments are (with your own italics) "*certa* quædam testimonia et *efficacia* signa *gratiæ* atque bonæ in nos voluntatis, *per quæ invisibiliter ipse in nobis operatur*, nostramque fidem in se non solum excitat, verum etiam confirmat."

My Lord, how often will you require to be reminded, that all this language is used freely by the highest Calvinists, and therefore is utterly useless for the purpose for which you quote it? You have just had, in the former part of this Letter, a proof that even in the notes of the Geneva Bible the same phraseology is used respecting the Sacraments. You have been compelled also, on a former occasion, to admit that similar language is used in the Confessions of the foreign "Reformed Communions." You had passages repeatedly placed before you from Calvin, Bullinger, and others of similar views, to the same effect. But, reckless of anything but the object you have in view, you here again quote the words as proving what you *now* well know they are quite incapable of proving.

Before I pass on, I would also just point out two notable fallacies in the arguments raised by your advocates out of the Articles. It was urged, that because the Articles say that the Baptism of infants is most agreeable with the institution of Christ, therefore infants must all be entitled to receive the grace of that Sacrament. The fallacy of this may be at once shewn by applying the same mode of reasoning to the case of adults. It is most agreeable with the institution of Christ that all adults, making a profession of faith and repentance, should be baptized. But are they, therefore, all worthy?

Again, it was urged that if infants were not all worthy recipients, then some must be unworthy, and therefore by the Articles "purchased to themselves damnation." It is difficult to conceive how such an argument could be seriously put forward. An infant, supposed to be *incapable* of *actual* sin, cannot "purchase to itself damnation" by any act of its own, much less by an act performed upon it against its will by others. And yet, nevertheless, the general doctrine laid down in the Articles on this subject refers to all cases; but, of course, when applied to cases differently circumstanced, must be interpreted in accordance with the circumstances of the particular case. If an adult, coming without faith and repentance, purchases to himself damnation by undergoing Baptism in such a state, then, in accordance with this doctrine, an infant lying under God's wrath, as our Church teaches us that all do by nature,—though not committing, in its Baptism, actual sin, (of which it is incapable, and of which it could not be rendered guilty by an act performed upon it against its will by another) and therefore not purchasing to itself damnation,—is not *entitled* to receive the grace of Baptism in that Sacrament.

You next urge (p. 62) that *the Catechism* was "the most obvious," and "incomparably the fittest document to explain what might be doubtful to the Judges in the Articles." Have you forgotten, my Lord, that to this very document they did refer, and found it testifying against you? The words to which you refer in it, namely, those which give a definition of a Sacrament, are wholly insufficient for your purpose. If you ask their meaning, I have already pointed it out, p. 34 above. But there is another part of it, namely, that relating to the promises made

for infants, to which you have *not adverted,* which has been justly pointed out in the Judgment as entirely opposed to your doctrine; and was given up by your Advocates in both Courts as, according to your view, an incorrect answer.* And if I chose to resort to such weapons, I might here turn your whole artillery of sarcasm, about the assent and consent given to the Book of Common Prayer, against yourself.

The "awful heresy" which you proceed to charge upon Mr. Gorham, (and which, you tell us, without a shadow of ground for the assertion, has been "distinctly pronounced by the Church to be such") being one of your own making, calls for but few words. The "heresy" is the assertion, that the grace of the Sacrament of Baptism, "a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness," is "not received in or through that Sacrament, but must be received previously through a prævenient act of grace on God's part." Now, my Lord, if this is "heresy," you must be at least close upon heresy yourself; for at p. 22 we find you commenting on His Grace's remark that "the grace of spiritual regeneration is separable, and in fact often separated, from the Sacrament of Baptism," in these words,—"In the case of adults baptized, no one would question this." So that you allow that, in the case of adults, the grace is *often* separated from the Sacrament. And if this is undeniable in the case of adults, it can hardly be "heresy" to suppose it to be so in the case of infants. But the truth is, that this is not a fair representation of Mr. Gorham's doctrine, being a partial and defective one. The grant of regeneration previous to Baptism does not evacuate the effect of the Sacrament, or make it of no avail in formally making over the grace of the Sacrament (*i. e.* the regenerate state) according to the nature of that rite, or, consequently, separate the grace from the Sacrament in worthy recipients; and therefore you have not correctly represented the real question at issue.

Hence, your attack here upon His Grace for "permitting" the Judges "to deceive themselves so grossly," and for sanctioning their Judgment, returns upon yourself.

You next charge the Judicial Committee with having "*wan-*

* Mr. Maskell, in his "Second Letter," just published (p. 34), takes the same view of the words.

tonly, and in spite of warning, omitted to give attention" to the 57th Canon. And you tell them, after various remarks of a similar kind, that in not doing so "they were *guilty of a grievous violation of their plain duty*."

Very suitable words, doubtless, with which to address the eminent Judges who gave Judgment against you! And what is the cause of this language? Simply that they differed from you in the interpretation of the Canon. My Lord, I need not tell you, that I feel no surprise at their not having thought it worth notice, as this matter has already been a subject of discussion between us.* You say,—

"The Canon says, 'The *doctrine* of Baptism is sufficiently set down in the Book of Common Prayer to be used at the administration of the said Sacrament, as nothing can be added to it that is material or necessary.' The Judges virtually say, that there is no doctrine of Baptism in those offices by which it is administered."

And you then proceed to use language towards the Judges which can excite only a feeling of pain at the scandal produced by such outbreaks on the part of a Bishop of our Church.

My Lord, the Judges have uttered nothing of the kind. But they *do* say, and most justly say, that "the received Formularies cannot be held to be evidence of faith or of doctrine, *without reference to* the distinct declarations of doctrine in the Articles, and to *the faith, hope, and charity, by which they profess to be inspired or accompanied*." And they go on to show, how the expressions in such a Service ought to be interpreted, to make that Service speak *the doctrine which it was intended to speak*. The question is as to the right mode of interpretation.

And as I have already pointed out to your Lordship on a former occasion, it is only by wresting a portion of the Canon from its context, and concealing its true nature and object, that you manage to get the appearance of an argument out of it. The case is this. The Puritans were in the habit of teaching the people that the Sacraments were not *valid* unless accompanied by preaching. In opposition to such a notion, the Canon (which is entitled, "The Sacraments not to be refused at the hands of unpreaching ministers") enacts as follows,—

* See my Vindication of the "Defence of the Thirty-Nine Articles," in reply to the Charge of the Bishop of Exeter, pp. 50, 51.

"Whereas divers persons, seduced by false teachers, do refuse to have their children baptized by a minister that is no preacher, and to receive the Holy Communion at his hands in the same respect, *as though the virtue of these Sacraments did depend upon his ability to preach;* forasmuch as the doctrine both of Baptism and of the Lord's Supper is so sufficiently set down in the Book of Common Prayer to be used at the administration of the said Sacraments, as nothing can be added unto it that is *material and necessary;* we do require and charge every such person, seduced as aforesaid, to reform that their wilfulness, and to submit himself to the order of the Church in that behalf; both the said Sacraments being equally effectual, whether they be ministered by a minister that is no preacher, or by one that is a preacher."

The meaning, therefore, is perfectly clear; namely, that all which it is "material and necessary" to bring before the people, *when administering Baptism,* as to the nature of the rite, is contained in the appointed Service, and therefore that preaching on the occasion was not requisite. The doctrine is sufficiently set forth in the Service. *And so we all hold.*

This places the words quoted by you from the Canon in a totally different light from that in which you wish them to be viewed.

Connected with your unwarrantable attack upon the Judges in this part of your Letter, as influenced by "clamours from without or timid caution from within," is a statement respecting the number of those who support Mr. Gorham's views which requires to be met, especially as there has been a repetition of it in another quarter. You "venture to believe," that "there are not probably six men, calling themselves Churchmen, who partake of Mr. Gorham's special heresy."

If by Mr. Gorham's "special heresy," you mean the doctrine which you have wrongfully imputed to him, you may have correctly stated the number of those who hold such doctrine. But if you mean the doctrine which Mr. Gorham really holds, as the Judicial Committee has represented it from a fair, and general, and impartial survey of his answers and pleas as a whole, or as I have described it above, you should have multiplied your units by thousands; and if you mean doctrine of a similar character, as distinguished from your *opus operatum* doctrine, you may

double that mode of reckoning. They who would not use Mr. Gorham's language as to the need of "an act of prævenient grace," are wholly agreed with him as to the necessity of an infant coming to Baptism under circumstances different from those in which the mass lie—circumstances suitable to the terms of the covenant made in Baptism—in order that they may at the moment enjoy the full effects of that Sacrament. And here lies the substance and essence of the controversy between him and your Lordship. And the phrase used by Mr. Gorham seems intended to be but equivalent to one used by one of the most distinguished of our prelates in a former age,—who had been a chaplain to Archbishop Whitgift,—Bishop W. Barlow, who calls Baptism "*the seal of a præ-received grace.*"*

I proceed to the next point noticed in your Letter. It relates to the remark of the Judgment upon the following Rubric,—"It is certain by God's word that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved." That remark is, that "this Rubric does not, like the Article of 1536, say that such children are saved *by Baptism.*" And after *taking it for granted,* that the phrase "God's word" refers to certain passages of Scripture mentioned in the Service, and that those passages ascribe the salvation of the infant to Baptism, and *assuming* that the words of the Service necessarily bear the interpretation you put upon them, you give vent to your anger in the following words,—

"How then, and by what, are they saved? But I cannot argue such a matter. Suffice it to say, and I say it with a bitterness of feeling which I will not dissemble, that such is 'the *Judgment*' [your own sarcastic italics] of the Lord Chief Justice of England, of the Master of the Rolls, of one of the most eminent Barons of Her Majesty's Court of Exchequer, of the Chancellor of the Diocese of London, and of a Right Hon. and learned man whose name is more exalted than any title of office or dignity could make it; and that this Judgment has been adopted and sustained by the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury and the Lord Archbishop of York." (pp. 66, 67,)

My Lord, look over this list of names again, and see if you could have more effectually written your own condemnation than

* I have given the whole passage in "Effects of Infant Baptism," p. 291. or 2d ed. p. 324.

in thus reminding the reader, by whom the Judgment was given. These *are* the parties who have pointed out that *fact* as to the phraseology of the Rubric, the mention of which has called forth your "bitterness of feeling." And it is hardly necessary to add, that it is an important fact, bearing strongly upon the question at issue, because in a previous document (the Articles of 1536) the salvation of the infant had been expressly ascribed to Baptism, and salvation denied to the unbaptized. There was, therefore, a marked *change* in the language used, and a change which we cannot suppose to have been accidental. In fact it is obvious, that when the Church gave up the doctrine that infants dying unbaptized perish, (and I have proved that our Church did give up that doctrine,) it could no longer maintain, that the salvation of baptized infants was the consequence of Baptism. This single consideration shows that your Lordship's tragical exclamations against the Judges for not giving to the Rubric your interpretation, are as groundless as they are indecent. If we believe, or are not prepared to deny, that infants will be saved dying unbaptized, it is clear that we cannot ascribe the salvation of baptized infants *to* Baptism.

And nothing perhaps can show more clearly how utterly unreasonable is your inference from this Rubric, than the fact that Peter Martyr (free from the influence of any such Rubric or Canon requiring his acquiescence) voluntarily makes a similar statement in his Lectures at Oxford, as Regius Divinity Professor, at the same period. He says,—"I hope well concerning such infants [*i. e.* those who die unbaptized], because I see them to be born of believing parents .... *that infants dying after having received Baptism are saved, we ought to feel assured.*" * I need not tell your Lordship, however, what, notwithstanding this, were Peter Martyr's sentiments as to the effects of Baptism.

But the condition of Baptism is inserted in the Rubric by the Church, because the Church has no right to dispense with God's appointed ordinance for being made a member of the Church of Christ. Strictly speaking, the Church can take no notice of,

* De hujusmodi parvulis bene spero, quòd illos videam ex fidelibus parentibus natos .... pueros decedentes cum baptismo salvos esse *confidendum est.* (In 1 Cor. vii. 14.)

and pronounce no judgment upon, those who have not been introduced by Baptism into her fold.* And hence it is, that, in the Rubric to the Burial Service, it is directed that the Service is not to be read over one that dies unbaptized. No one can be treated by the Church as a member of Christ and a child of God, that is, a regenerate person, until after Baptism, the rite appointed for formally and publicly making over that character; just as no one is treated as a member of any society, until after his formal admission into it by the rite appointed for that purpose. But the question—*when* spiritual life is first granted by God—is not affected by this fact. And the Church is not called upon, and has not seen fit, to pronounce any judgment upon, or extend her rites to, one who has not been formally made a member of her Communion. And this affords a reply to your Lordship's remarks upon this *latter* Rubric in a subsequent page. (p. 69.)

You consider next the claims of the principle of *charitable hypothesis,* justly maintained by the Judicial Committee to be the principle on which the Church's Offices are constructed. This also, it seems, like everything else opposed to your views, is a great trial to your patience. And the reasoning with which you commence your attack upon it is too remarkable to be passed over without special notice.

You say,—

"True it is, as I have said already, all Common Prayer must be framed on the principle that those who join in it are in a state of acceptance with God. And why? Because Common Prayer is part of the Communion of Saints. Because the congregation, be it large or small, is 'gathered together in Christ's name'—that is, as members of Him. And when and how were they made His members? When and how were they entitled to admission to the Communion of Saints? In and by Baptism. And are we then to be gravely told, that the phrases which declare, in the most absolute terms which the wit of man can devise, that infants are in Baptism so made members of Christ, so born anew by spiritual regeneration, are mere words of charity and hope—and not of faith?" (p. 67.)

Let us put this argument in form. Common prayer must be

* See this more fully noticed in my Review of Sir H. J. Fust's Judgment, pp. 33—35.

drawn up as if all who joined in it were "in a state of acceptance with God," because it is "part of the communion of saints." Very good. This is just what the Judicial Committee say. Let us see, which reasons the most logically from this common proposition. But (you add) all who join in it were admitted to this communion in and by Baptism. Very true, again. The visible communion of saints consists of the baptized, and of such only. Now for the inference. *Therefore*, you conclude, Baptism must have made them all *really* saints, really "in a state of acceptance with God," "born anew, by spiritual regeneration!"

My Lord, to use your own words in this very place, *This I will not argue.*

You go on to what you call "the argument (if courtesy require us to call it by such a name) of the Judicial Committee." And your reply to it certainly puts the "courtesy" of your opponents to a severe test. But I will remember that it comes from a Septuagenarian and a Bishop, and will deal with it accordingly. The Judicial Committee refer to the Burial Service as one undeniably drawn up upon the principle of *charitable hypothesis.* You object to this first, that "In the offices of Baptism of infants, the Church speaks in absolute, categorical, direct terms; in that of Burial, it professes to use the language of *hope.*" Not so, my Lord. This is but half the truth. A portion of the Service you may explain in this way. But even *those* expressions are strong, and become more forcible when connected with those *other* expressions in the Service to which the Judgment expressly directs attention. And these *latter* are not to be explained on any other principle. They stand thus. "Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God, of his great mercy, to take unto himself the soul of our dear brother here departed," &c. And,—"We give thee *hearty thanks* for that it hath pleased thee to *deliver* this our brother *out of the miseries* of this sinful world." Let us hear your Lordship's comment on these passages,—the comment of one who professes to be horror-struck at any interpretation of the Prayer Book that does not give to the words their plain literal honest meaning.

On the former passage,—which you, who are so scrupulous

about accurate quotations, misquote, by leaving out *the very words* ("of his great mercy") which stamp upon the sentence its real meaning—you angrily ask His Grace why he did not "undeceive them," and "tell them that this is merely the application of a text of Ecclesiastes, which says of every man, be he good or bad, that while the spirit of a beast goes downward to the earth, the spirit of a man goes upward—i. e., as our Church has explained it, has ascended to Him who made it?" (p. 68.) I suppose His Grace might reply, by asking you why you had not cited the passage correctly, and by reminding you, that "the wicked" are "taken away"—not in God's "great mercy," but—"*in his wrath.*" (Ps. lviii. 9.) Their end is from *the wrath of God coming upon them.* (Ps. lxxviii. 31.)

On the latter passage, your comment is one of which I am unwilling to speak as it deserves. We may (you tell us) thank God "that it hath pleased Him to deliver this our brother out of the miseries of this sinful world," because "*if he departed in an impenitent state, we may and ought to think, that he was nevertheless taken away in mercy,—that his case was lost—that if life had been continued to him, he would have added sin to sin, and so would have been sunk in deeper perdition*"!! (p. 69.) So that if we *knew,* that he had "lifted up his eyes in hell, being in torments," we "ought" to "thank God," that he had *delivered him out of the miseries of this sinful world,* because if he had lived longer, he would doubtless have "added sin to sin!" My Lord, I will only say, that we are very much obliged to you for this explanation of the words. It will be of great service. It will tend to open people's eyes. Such an illustration of the way in which your principle of interpretation acts, will do more with many to place it in its true light, than anything I could have said.

But, after all, you seem to have some uncomfortable misgivings on the matter. For you proceed to remind us, that the Service was "designed by the Church when she was able to exercise that discipline, the want of which we now solemnly deplore." One question, my Lord, is all I shall offer upon this remark. Will any degree of discipline enable us to pronounce with positive certainty—with more than the language of hope and charity—upon the state of the majority of those we bury?

Your remark upon the Rubric I have already noticed.

Before I pass on, however, I must remind your Lordship of an argument on this point, the weight of which *you* at least are bound to admit. In your last Charge you pointed our attention to the *honesty* of the Dissenters at the Restoration, who, seeing that the Prayer Book taught "the doctrine of real baptismal regeneration and certain salvation consequent thereupon," refused their assent to the Book, and quitted the Church. Now, my Lord, these same Dissenters brought another objection against the Prayer Book, equally preventing their giving their assent to it. They could not subscribe (as your own informant, Calamy,* tells us,) because "they could not consent to pronounce *all saved* that are buried, except the unbaptized, excommunicate, and self-murtherers." And this they maintain the Prayer Book *does* pronounce. For "the priest must not only say, that God took away all such persons *in mercy, in great mercy,* but also positively *affirm that God took them to himself,* &c. . . . . They could not see how charity would excuse dangerous errors and *falsehood.*"

My Lord, *they* were at least self-consistent. They applied to *both* Services *the same* principle of interpretation. They did not play fast and loose with the Prayer Book, applying one principle of interpretation to one Service, and another to another Service, to make it correspond with their own private views and prejudices. They treated it as a consistent whole; and having unfortunately been unable to see the admissibility of the hypothetical principle of interpretation, they adopted another which compelled them to reject the Book. And in doing so, they were (as I have said) at least self-consistent. And as their example is one to which you have yourself referred us, permit me to present it again to your Lordship in a more impartial point of view.

Your next statement, that the words "Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that this child is regenerate," refer to "a question of fact on which no serious mind would dare to speak thus positively without sufficient warrant," (p. 70), is, of course, not

* Life of Baxter, &c.

an argument, but an unsupported assertion involving the very question at issue, and therefore it does not require an answer. But I would just remind your Lordship, that the same remark might be made on various other passages of the Prayer Book, where it is clear that no positive assertion was, or could be, intended. The great question is, upon what principle is the Prayer Book drawn up, and according as we determine *this*, must we decide how far such passages as that referred to bear out your conclusion.

The declarations to which you refer in the Catechism must likewise be taken in connexion with the whole doctrine of the Church, and more especially with other parts of the Catechism itself, to which attention has been directed in the Judgment, and which your Lordship has passed over in profound, but prudent, silence.

You pass on to the Act of Uniformity, and being of course much better qualified than Her Majesty's Judges to interpret Acts of Parliament, or at least much more honest, having no such private feelings to gratify, or personal motives to sway your conduct, as you impute to them, you directly accuse the Judges of having *deliberately and consciously* passed over a law having a "*conclusive* bearing on the matter in issue." (pp. 59, 60, 71.)

My Lord, the very fact that the Judges who sat on this case *did* pass over this Act in silence, after having had their attention called to it in the pleadings, will be sufficient to convince all impartial persons that it has no bearing on the question at issue. In fact, it must be obvious to the most ill-informed—to the meanest capacity—that in a question touching *the interpretation* to be given to the Prayer Book, where both sides are agreed in accepting the Prayer Book itself as sound and Scriptural, an Act merely requiring such acceptance of the Prayer Book is wholly irrelevant to the matter at issue. You might as well send us to a Church-building Act. But your Lordship is well aware, how easy it is to throw dust into the eyes of the public on such matters, so as to blind them to the real question. Tacitly assuming the very point in controversy, that the doctrine you are opposing is contrary to what is contained in the Prayer Book, and also that your opponents are consciously con-

tradicting the doctrine of that Book, you send us to an Act of Parliament requiring the acceptance of the doctrine of the Prayer Book, as if it settled the question, when in fact it does not *touch* it.

But your remarks upon the Act are not of a nature to be passed over in silence. Little as the exposure of their real character may effect as it regards your Lordship's own mind, it is not the less necessary that public attention should be directed to them.

You first notice the Preamble of the Act, in which it is stated that His Majesty had authorised Convocation to review the Book of Common Prayer, and "make such alterations and additions in the said Book as to them should seem most meet and convenient." You put the word "make" in italics, for a purpose which we shall see presently. But the attempt to raise an argument out of it is fruitless; for in the first place, the alterations and additions do not touch the point in question; and secondly, (as you are well aware) this "*making*" was only equivalent to *proposing*, subject to the approval of the King and the two Houses of Parliament, (as the Preamble also expresses in words which you have suppressed*), and does not imply any power in Convocation to *determine* the matter.

You then proceed to remark, that every one admitted to the ministry is required "to declare his unfeigned assent and consent to the use of all things in the said Book contained and prescribed, in these words and no other: 'I, A. B., do hereby declare my unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in and by the book intituled the Book of Common Prayer,' &c." And upon this you favour us with the following remarks. You tell us that the previous subscription to the Book, (which had been required, and is still required, by the thirty-sixth Canon), namely, a declaration that it "*containeth in it nothing contrary to the word of God*, and that it may lawfully so be used; and that he himself will use the form in the said Book prescribed, in public Prayer and administra-

* "All which his Majesty *having duly considered*, hath fully approved and allowed the same, and *recommended* to the present Parliament, that the said Books..... be the Book which shall be appointed to be used," &c.

tion of the Sacraments, and none other," had been found insufficient. "Fatal experience," you say, "had shown the insufficiency of subscription, and of A MERE OBLIGATION TO USE THE BOOK. The only security for the faithful use of it was 'assent and consent' to all that it contained, and such security was given by the Statute." So that here, to answer the purpose of the moment, you actually represent the stringent declaration of the Canon, directly binding us to the belief that the Prayer Book "*containeth in it nothing contrary to the word of God,*" as "*a mere obligation to use the Book*"!! My Lord, if I was inclined to descend to the use of such language as, in your recent Charge, and in the passage which I shall have to notice presently in your Letter, you have addressed towards myself, there are no words which would be too strong to denounce such a statement. Having formerly committed yourself to the mistake, that the Declaration required by the Act of Uniformity is more stringent than the subscription required by the Canon, (in evident ignorance of the context of that Declaration,) you now disparage and explain away the meaning of the Canon, in order to countenance your interpretation of the Act. The plain words of the Canon, that the Prayer Book "containeth in it nothing contrary to the word of God," are to be misinterpreted as involving only "a mere obligation to use the Book," while the equally plain words of the Act, that the Declaration required by it is a Declaration of "unfeigned assent and consent to the *use* of all things in the said Book contained and prescribed," are to be equally misinterpreted in the other direction, or rather put out of sight, as if there were no such explanation of the meaning of the Declaration to be found in the Act.

The object of Parliament, in requiring such a Declaration in addition to subscription to the Canon, is obvious. The Declaration was to be made publicly, in the house of God, before the people. Subscription to the Canon was only to be made privately before the Bishop. The former, therefore, was a more formal and express and solemn acknowledgment of the views and intentions of the party, than the latter; and being enforced by Statute, was of still stronger obligation. But so far as concerns the obligation laid upon the party subscribing and declar-

ing with respect to the Prayer Book, the Canon is stronger than the Declaration. For the Declaration of assent and consent required by the Act is limited in the context to the *use* of the Book.

The very mention, however, of this FACT, (of which your Lordship was evidently in complete ignorance until I pointed it out in my "Defence of the XXXIX Articles,") has called forth from you, both in your late Charge and in this Letter, language as disgraceful to its author as it is harmless to the party assailed.

In the face of both, *I here repeat the statement of the fact;* and I shall now repeat also the passages with which I accompanied that statement, and some of the authorities by which I proved, in my reply to your Charge, that that statement was correct.

My statement was accompanied by the following among other passages:—

"Morally, I must earnestly maintain that they [*i. e.* the declarations required by the Act of Uniformity,] are of equal force [with that of the 36th Canon,] because no man ought to give his assent and consent to the *use* of all things contained and prescribed in the Book, who thinks any part of it 'contrary to the Word of God.'" (Def. of XXXIX Art. p. 10.)

"Am I then here advocating liberty being granted to the ministers of the Church to give or withhold their assent to the Prayer Book, as accordant with Holy Scripture? Far from it. . . . . By the 36th Canon, all ministers will still be required at ordination, institution, &c., to testify by subscription their belief that the Prayer Book 'containeth in it nothing contrary to the Word of God, and that it may lawfully so be used.' *Any man, therefore, who believes that any portion of the Prayer Book conveys unscriptural doctrine, will be bound at once to retire from a ministry which he can only lawfully exercise through the instrumentality of a subscription to the contrary effect.* And if he does not do so, and attempts to propagate his view of the unscriptural character of any portion of the Prayer Book, he will still be most justly amenable to the Ecclesiastical Courts, as one who is *violating his subscription, and breaking faith with the Church.*" (*Ib.* pp. 26, 27.)

Such was the context of the statement referred to.

Of the authorities to prove the correctness of the statement, I will here, for the sake of brevity, give but two; referring you to my reply to your Lordship's Charge for others.

Dr. Fulwood, Archdeacon of Totnes, in a work *published in* 1662, *immediately on the passing of the Act,* writes thus:—

"For the perfect removal of any such scruple for ever, let the Act interpret itself. The words immediately foregoing this Declaration are these. 'Every minister ..... shall declare his unfeigned assent and consent to the Use of all things in the said Book contained and prescribed in these words and no other:' they are the words of this Declaration. Mark: we must declare our unfeigned assent and consent. To what? Not simply to all things, but to all things with respect to their *use:* to the use of all things in the said Book. But in what words must we declare for the use of all things in the said Book? In these words and no other: and they are, as was said, the words of the Declaration. The plain meaning of the Act appears, therefore, to be but this: while we declare, in these words, viz. of the Declaration, we do but declare our unfeigned assent and consent to the use of [the] Common Prayer: which if we can lawfully use, we do but declare, that if we do conform, we do nothing against our consciences: or that, we do unfeignedly assent and consent to the *use* of that which we ourselves either do, or can use. And as if our governors had *purposed to make this their meaning* AS PLAIN AS THE SUN, they have at least twice more given us the same interpretation of those words."*

The other testimony shall be from Bishop Stillingfleet, who, in his Sermon on "The Mischief of Separation," thus urges the same view:—

"It is a very hard case with a Church, when men shall set their wits to strain every thing to the worst sense, *to stretch laws beyond the intention and design of them,* .... and will not distinguish between their *approbation of the use* and of the *choice* of things; for upon such terms as these, men think to justify the present divisions. I much question whether, if they proceed in such manner, they can hold communion with any Church in the Christian world." (p. 49.)

The same view is maintained by Dr. Falkner in his "Libertas Ecclesiastica," and by other writers living near the time of the

* The Grand Case of the present Ministry, 1662. 12mo. pp. 11, 12.

passing of the Act.* In fact, I know of none, living at that period, who took a different view.

Reckless, however, of these authorities, which I brought before you in my Reply to your Charge, showing that the meaning I had given to the Act was, beyond all question, the correct interpretation—reckless of the proof given that your statement of my views was in direct contradiction to the truth—you here again pour forth a repetition of your former calumnies, as if the strength of your cause lay in false accusations of your opponents.

You first inform the Archbishop, that you are "quite sure" that my statement on this point (that is, the statement of *a fact*) "has been received by His Grace with the same disgust as by yourself." Do you suppose, my Lord, that there can be two opinions as to the character of this statement? And you then proceed thus,—

"I here cite these words, not for the very idle purpose of exposing their weakness no less than their WICKEDNESS, but—1st, As a proof that there is among the ministers of our Church at this day a spirit which requires the faithful *exercise of vigilance* in all among us who have consented [*consented*] to undertake the high office of Bishops in the Church. But I have cited it, 2ndly and principally, in order to show that THIS PARTY FEELS THAT THE PLAIN, THE DIRECT MEANING OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER [which they have *solemnly vowed* that they believe to contain nothing in it contrary to the word of God, and which they are constantly using and putting into the mouths of their people in the House of God,] IS OPPOSED TO SOME OF THEIR OWN FAVOURITE TENETS." (pp. 73, 74.)

To whose statements, my Lord, the charges of "*weakness*" and "WICKEDNESS" belong, I shall willingly leave to the determination of the public. That "there is among the ministers of our Church at this day a spirit which requires the faithful *exercise of vigilance* in all" the authorities of the Church, and all who desire to uphold the truth among us, I entirely agree with your Lordship; and that among those ministers will be

* See my "Vindication of the Defence of the XXXIX Articles," pp. 55—58. I might with ease add others to those here quoted; and among them, if I recollect right, Bp. Beveridge in one of his Sermons.

found some high in office in the Church. Happy would it be for our Church, if its discipline were in such a state that these "ministers" could be more effectually restrained from making their own will their law of action, and substituting the prejudices of an ill-informed mind for the doctrines of the Church. And *watched,* you may rest assured, they will be.

That you have quoted certain words "in order to show" that the party opposed to you is *guilty of perjury,* is beyond all question; precisely as——but I will let such language speak for itself.

My Lord, when I first entered into controversy with your Lordship, I was quite aware of the consequences to which I was exposing myself in the character of the language which I should be called to encounter. But there are some occasions on which duty demands a sacrifice of personal feeling. The position in which you have been placed, gives a publicity to your statements which requires that their real nature should be exposed. Otherwise I need not inform you, that a "Charge" or a "Letter" from the Plaintiff in the Cause of the Bishop of Exeter *v.* Latimer, would have needed no reply.

That one, of whom a jury of his countrymen, in his own Cathedral town, have pronounced,—that language speaking of him (in terms which I shall not repeat) as unworthy of belief, is proper and justifiable,—should fling around him, with a profuse hand, similar accusations against others, is not more than was to be expected. It is not wonderful that you should seek relief in branding others with the same imputation; conscious as you must justly feel, that you may give vent to the most unlimited abuse with the most perfect impunity. Whatever it might be, no cause of action could lie against you for it. I quite grant that you would be *triumphantly* acquitted, if charged with libelling. For the question would be, What damage has it inflicted? And the incredulity of any jury that could be selected, on such a point, would, beyond all question, be insuperable.

But what does *your cause* really gain by all this? Absolutely nothing. There is no question between you and the parties you are now assailing, as to their obligation to accept the Prayer Book precisely as it stands, and to believe and maintain it to be

sound and Scriptural. Their views in this respect have been stated over and over again in the strongest terms. But, resolved to misrepresent them, in order that you may have a *locus standi* with the public, you persevere in statements which it is impossible rightly to characterize, without the use of language to which (familiar as controversy with your Lordship may make it to one's ear) I shall not lend myself.

But I proceed with the task I have undertaken, thankful that a labour which at almost every step gives fresh cause for aversion draws near its conclusion.

The very next point I am called to notice is a direct, palpable, and (to use your own word) "wanton" misrepresentation of facts. I will give your own statement of the matter, that its real nature may be the better seen in its full length and breadth. You tell us that the Act of Uniformity—

"Enables us to ascertain the sense in which that Book [the Prayer Book] is sanctioned by the Legislature, by telling us by whom, after what consideration, and in what sense it was 'made.' It was 'made' by Convocation, after having been 'prepared' by twelve members of the Upper House, and many leading members of the Lower House, after a long and very minute discussion of many portions of it with the heads of the Nonconformists, who sought very important alterations in it. This discussion was holden with the authority of a Commission under the Great Seal; the terms of which Commission required that the Commissioners 'should certify and present to the King, in writing under their hands, the matters and things whereupon they shall so determine for his approbation.' This, my Lord, was done; [*read*, NOT DONE,] and we have, as your Grace well knows, [*read*, WELL KNOWS NOT TO BE THE CASE,] the result of their 'resolutions and determinations,' so presented to the King, in the document commonly called 'the Savoy Conference.' It would probably be impossible to produce another equally clear authority for the meaning of the Legislature, [seeing that they cared not one straw for the discussions of the Savoy Conference, of which they probably knew scarcely anything] the *animus imponentis*, in the case of any other Statute which can be named. Whatsoever particulars, therefore, are clearly laid down in the Acts of that Conference, must be held to be an authoritative exposition of any words of the Book of Common Prayer on which those Commissioners have pronounced

plainly, if the proper construction of such words shall be brought into question."

You then proceed to say, that "what they so pronounced" on the words in the Offices of Baptism "must be held to declare the doctrine of the Church on Baptism;" and after giving several extracts from a published Report of the Conference as reprinted by Dr. Cardwell, you conclude,—

"In these determinations, [*i. e.* the answers of a few Bishops to a few Presbyterians in the Conference] I affirm, for the reasons which I have given above, that we have a clear statement of what was the mind of the Convocation, and therefore of the Parliament (which simply accepted its decision), [!!!] respecting the doctrine concerning Baptism, in the Offices of Baptism." (pp. 74—77.)

Now, my Lord, whether it be from ignorance of the facts of the case, or from any other cause, I shall not stop to inquire,—for it makes little difference as far as your Lordship is concerned, and none as far as truth is concerned—but this whole statement is one tissue of misrepresentations from the beginning to the end. So far from the Book being "*made* by Convocation after having been prepared" at the Savoy Conference, as you represent, the Book is *expressly* recognized in the Act of Uniformity as *the Book put forth in the first year of Queen Elizabeth* with certain "alterations and additions" made in Convocation and accepted by Parliament. And it is a fact with which your Lordship ought to have been perfectly familiar, that the Commission that sat at the Savoy was appointed for only four months; and the whole of that time having been spent in useless altercation between the opposing parties, it came to an end without producing any result of any kind.*

So far from the "resolutions and determinations" of the Savoy Conference being presented to the King, as found in the document called "the Savoy Conference," no report at all of the kind was presented to the King from the Savoy Conference; and for the very best possible reason, namely, that there were no "resolutions and determinations" to present, because nothing was agreed upon there; and the alterations and additions in the

* See Cardwell's Conferences, pp. 264—266.

Prayer Book are expressly mentioned in the Act as having been presented to the King by Convocation; and the document called the Savoy Conference, is only an unauthorized and anonymous account of its proceedings.*

So far, therefore, from the Acts of this Conference being any authority for "the meaning of the Legislature" in the Act of Uniformity, or any "authoritative exposition of any words of the Book of Common Prayer," or any declaration of "the doctrine of the Church on Baptism," or anything else, they are merely the record of four months' disputing and quarrelling between a few of the heads of the Episcopalian and Dissenting parties. And it clearly appears that the proceedings of the Conference were (as usual in such cases) principally managed by two or three of the hottest spirits on both sides, but for whom the Conference might have come to a very different termination. To say, therefore, that we have, in the Acts of this Conference, "a clear statement of what was the mind of Convocation," is entirely opposed to fact. But to add that we have, in the statements of a few bishops in the Savoy Conference, a declaration of the mind of *Parliament*, when it sanctioned Q. Elizabeth's Prayer Book with a few alterations and additions of little moment, is an assertion criminally reckless and unjustifiable. The Houses of Parliament did not consider themselves bound to accept the alterations proposed by Convocation; much less would they suffer themselves to be led by the dogmas of a few disputers at the Savoy Conference. And the recorded proceedings of the Houses of Parliament on the occasion, so completely overturn your Lordship's statements upon this subject, that I make no apology for repeating here the summary view of them I have already placed before the public in a larger work.

"We find that the House of Commons (however indisposed to favour the violent Nonconformists) were very jealous of any alterations being made in the Book by Convocation, lest they should introduce into it Laudian views. So little were they inclined to defer to the views of Convocation about the Prayer Book, that on the 9th

* An account of all the proceedings of the Commissioners, &c. Lond.: printed for R. H. 1661. 4to. The Nonconformists presented a Petition to the King, complaining of what took place in the Conference; but the Episcopalians do not seem to have made any report to the King of *any kind.*

of July, 1661, before Convocation had had time to make any progress in their revision of the Book, 'a "Bill for the uniformity of public Prayer and administration of the Sacraments," was read for a third time, and, together with a copy of the Prayer Book, printed in 1604, was passed and sent to the Upper House;'* the book of 1604 being selected, Dr. Cardwell supposes, in order to avoid any alterations by Archbishop Laud. The consideration of this Bill was deferred by the Lords, and its first reading did not take place till the 14th of February, 1662. 'Three days afterwards it passed through the second reading, and was placed in the hands of a select committee. The Book of Common Prayer, however, [that is, the Book as revised by Convocation] was not yet delivered to them; and the Committee having inquired on the 13th of February, with strong symptoms of impatience, whether they should still wait for it, or should "proceed upon the book brought from the Commons," they received a Royal message on the 25th of the same month, together with an authentic copy of the corrected Prayer Book confirmed under the Great Seal.'† This revised Book having been substituted for the other, and some other amendments introduced into the Bill, the Bill passed the House of Lords on the 9th of April, 1662, and was returned to the House of Commons. The House of Lords was satisfied with the alterations made, and passed them *sub silentio:* but as to the sense in which the Book was understood, each member of course acted upon his own view of it. And it is very clear, that they did not consider themselves bound to abide by what took place in Convocation, for they proceeded as far as the Committee with the Book of 1604, when they must have known that Convocation had completed a revision of the Book, and were evidently inclined to have brought the matter to a conclusion upon that Book, if the revised Book had not been at once submitted to them.

"But the feeling with which the House of Commons acted in the matter is still more strongly marked; for when the Bill was returned to them from the Lords with the revised Book of Common Prayer, 'it appears,' says Dr. Cardwell, 'that the Commons were jealous of the preference given to the corrected Book of Common Prayer over the edition of 1604, and suspecting that some differences might have been introduced between the two periods when the books were respectively printed, *directed a close comparison to be made between them.* On the 16th of April, they proceeded so far in their fear of change, as to make it a question *whether they should not reconsider*

* Card. Conf. p. 376. † Ib. p. 377.

the corrections made in Convocation; and though they decided to adopt them without further examination, *the division was only of ninety-six to ninety in their favour.* In order to save the dignity of the House, they afterwards divided on the question whether they had the power of reconsidering such corrections, and then obtained a vote in the affirmative.'* And Dr. Cardwell adds, that '*the fear, which the Commons seem to have contracted,* that occasion would be taken for introducing into the Liturgy the religious sentiments of Archbishop Laud and his school of theologians, was not altogether without foundation.'† Glad enough, no doubt, would the Laudian party have been, if they could have introduced various alterations into our Formularies at this time. But, providentially, the power of doing so was not in their hands.

"So much, then, for the feelings with which the Houses of Parliament were actuated on this occasion." (Eff. of Inf. Bapt. pp. 480, 481.)

It is difficult to conceive, how your Lordship could venture, in the face of such notorious facts, to advance a string of assertions not one of which has the least foundation in truth. And I leave for your consideration the position in which you have placed yourself, when, after such a specimen of your qualifications for the office of supreme adviser of Her Majesty and the Judges of the realm, you wind up your misstatements with the indignant admonition, that "*this* was *the Law* which the Judicial Committee were bound both to recognise and to carry out in their Judgment;" and that, inasmuch as, presuming to decline following such a profoundly learned authority, they "shut their eyes against it," you "appeal to another and a higher tribunal."

I have now, my Lord, gone through everything in your Letter which, by the utmost stretch of courtesy, could be called an argument or an authority. And I leave the determination of the questions at issue between us to the judgment of the public.

The remainder of the Letter consists of vague charges against the Archbishop and the Judges of being swayed by unworthy motives, misrepresentations of the facts of the case, self-sufficient denunciations of the Judgment, a bold avowal that you have introduced into the Church a state of "anarchy," and finally a

* Ib. p. 378. † Ib. p. 389.

Protest announcing that you are prepared to set at defiance the authorities under which the Providence of God has placed you.

My remarks upon all this will be but few. The character of those whom you have assailed renders any defence of their conduct, any vindication of their motives, worse than superfluous. Your imputations against them I pass over. I will not waste time in noticing them.—Your misrepresentation of Mr. Gorham's doctrine, and consequently of the light in which it is regarded in the Church, and of the view which would have been taken of a decision adverse to his claims, I have already dealt with; and shall not, therefore, go over that ground again.—But the false reasoning put forth to justify that state of anarchy which you boldly avow that you have introduced among us, does need a few words.

You tell us, my Lord, of your love for obedience to constituted authorities; and that it is only when their ordinance is "unhappily against God" that we may disobey them; that "in proportion as we love order, rule, and authority, and as our thoughts of the sacredness of the character of the judge and of judgment, are bound up with the sanctions of our holy religion, it is a very sore evil to be obliged to slight them: it is the first stone, whose removal loosens the whole fabric." (p. 84.) Smooth and plausible words, no doubt,—but prefacing only an apology for rebellion. And why do you introduce this "sore evil," and "loosen the whole fabric" of society? Forsooth, because the authorities under which you are placed as a Minister of our Church, have decided that you are not to exclude from its ministry all who do not take what you think an orthodox view on the subject of the effects of Baptism! Assuming that you and your party are the infallible depositaries of "the Catholic faith," you affix the brand of heresy without hesitation upon all who differ from you, and pronounce, *ex cathedra*, that "the Court which decided otherwise [than agreeably to your view], decided contrary to the faith," and that its Judgment is to be met by open resistance. The law, as proclaimed by those who have authority to deliver it, is to be despised and set at nought. It is not agreeable to your view of what is just and right, and therefore you will rebel against it.

My Lord, be it so that your doctrine is the orthodox doctrine, the genuine "Catholic faith;" be it even, if you please,—what, with rare powers of self-confidence, you represent it to be,—a fundamental article of faith; is rebellion against the authorities under which the Providence of God has placed you, the weapon by which it is to be maintained? Do you propose its establishment by the creation of a state of "anarchy," which may enable you and your party to seize, in the confusion, the reins of power? Truly, my Lord, you here afford us a very pregnant proof of the genuineness of your "Catholic faith." It is sufficiently characterized by its fruits. Thank God, you have learned no such lesson from your opponents. *Their* "Catholic faith," my Lord, teaches them very different conduct, as you are well aware, under adverse decisions of their Ecclesiastical rulers. Prepared to defend the truth with equal vigour, equal firmness,—prepared to maintain the rights of conscience, if necessary, against sinful requirements,—they are not prepared to throw the Church into a state of anarchy, because it is not ruled according to their mind,—because everybody is not expelled from it by its authorities who does not hold what they believe to be the truth; they are not prepared to excommunicate their ecclesiastical superiors, because of decisions that contravene their views of doctrine. The means by which *they* have endeavoured to propagate the faith, have been of a very different kind. They believe that the wisdom that produces "confusion and every evil work" "descendeth not from above;" the wisdom that is from above being "first pure, then peaceable, gentle and easy to be intreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy." They believe that truth is best seen in the light of holiness and peace; that it comes with the strongest recommendations when connected with obedience to the practical precepts of the Christian faith; that it has as little communion with resistance to "the ordinance of God," lawful authority, (when requiring no sinful act,) as light with darkness, or Christ with Belial. And therefore, however much they might lament a decision adverse to their views, they would not prostitute the functions of any office they might hold in the Church to the promotion of *anarchy*, the purposes of *rebellion*. If requirements were made of them inconsistent with their duty to God, they would retire from a

position which they could no longer hold with a pure conscience.

But what, my Lord, are you asked to do? Nothing. You are not even called upon to aid *ministerially* in the performance of the act you so much deprecate. In no way are you affected by the recent Judgment, except in being restrained by it from imposing upon others the iron yoke of your own private dogmas, which you choose to call "the Catholic faith." And the Judgment rests for its authority upon those very laws to which you owe your own power. If the Judgment may be disobeyed and despised, *you* fall with it. The law which has protected those under your episcopal supervision, is the law to which you are indebted for the power of exercising and enforcing that supervision. In assailing the authority of that law, you are overturning your own. And mournful is the reflection, that such an example of contempt for constituted authorities should have been set by one verging upon the limit of human existence,—called upon by his position to do all in his power to strengthen the bonds of law and order, by which society is kept together,—bound by his own solemn vow to "maintain and set forward, as much as should lie in him, *quietness, love, and peace among men.*"

Bewail the Judgment if you please. Uphold what you believe to be the truth. No one will think it worth while to endeavour to stop you, or to impede your efforts in making converts, or, probably, to trouble himself with the question, what doctrine you hold. But take heed how you trample upon the rights of others,—how you set at defiance the majesty of the law,—how you let loose a wild spirit of insubordination, confusion, and anarchy, from which, if you were successful, you would be one of the first to suffer.

If you are convinced that the Judgment has cut off the National Church of this country from the Church Catholic, quit her communion. The most perfect liberty is afforded you of going where you will, and maintaining what you will, and doing anything you will—except of abusing the power entrusted to your hands under the solemn obligation of a vow of the most sacred character, that you will act "according to *such authority*" "as to you shall be committed by THE ORDINANCE OF THIS REALM;" of an oath of "due reverence and obedience" to your

Primate; of repeated recognitions of the supremacy of your Sovereign "as well in ALL SPIRITUAL *or Ecclesiastical* things or CAUSES as temporal."

But what means such language as the following, from one who—by the office he holds in a Church bound by certain received and recognized laws—by his own voluntary vows, declarations, and oaths—is pledged, *so long as he retains that office,* to submit to the determinations of the authorities under which he has placed himself?

"I have to protest, not only against the Judgment pronounced in the recent Cause, but also against the regular consequences of that Judgment. I have to protest against your Grace's doing what you will be speedily called to do, either in person, or by some other exercising your authority. I have to protest, and I do hereby solemnly protest, before the Church of England, before the Holy Catholic Church, before Him who is its Divine Head, against your giving mission to exercise cure of souls, within my Diocese, to a clergyman who proclaims himself to hold the heresies which Mr. Gorham holds. I protest that any one who gives mission to him till he retract, is a favourer and supporter of those heresies. I protest, in conclusion, that I cannot, without sin—and by God's grace I will not—hold communion with him, be he who he may, who shall so abuse the high commission which he bears." (p. 90.)

My Lord, if by these words you mean that you are about to retire to a more suitable communion than the Church of England, be it so. You will not ask us to lament your departure. Nor shall you hear from me words of exultation or insult. Or if you mean that you will withdraw from the Primate the light of your presence, and the blessing of your communion and "affectionate friendship," why then, my Lord,—if you have really made up your mind—so it must be. And I will only hope that His Grace may be enabled to bear the deprivation with equanimity.

But if you mean, what your words appear to mean, that, retaining your position in this Church and country as the Bishop of Exeter, you will set at defiance your Primate and your Sovereign; that you will place yourself in a state of open rebellion against the laws of your country; then, my Lord, I leave you, without fear, to reap the due reward of broken vows and violated

oaths; feeling well assured, that the majesty of the law will obtain as easy a triumph over Devonshire and Cornish rebels *now*, as it did three centuries ago.*

But, before you commit yourself to such a course, at least look round and mark the position in which you are just now placed. My Lord, when you commenced your crusade against Mr. Gorham, you had by your side, aiding, counselling, and supporting you, one upon whose judgment and erudition in such matters you placed no small reliance. Where, my Lord, do you *now* find your adviser? What is his *present* view of the case? Hear his own words.†

"Now that the appeal has been decided by the confirmation of the report of the Judicial Committee, I see no objection to admitting, that on one account it seemed not improbable that it would be given in favour of Mr. Gorham. As the case went on, first, in the Court of Arches, and afterwards before the Privy Council, it was impossible not to feel, more and more, that the reasons and arguments of the evangelical party had been too lightly esteemed. During the last two years, my attention had been constantly directed in other ways to the same matter, and, it must as fairly be confessed, with similar results. Few of our own opinions would dispute,—at least I would not,—the absolute necessity of rejecting Mr. Gorham, after such answers as he gave in his examination before the bishop; yet every month, as it went by, suggested in my own mind graver and graver doubts as to the final success of such a proceeding, unavoidable as it was. I mean, doubts whether a bishop is really following the intention of the reformed church of England, and speaking in her spirit, when he condemns as heresy the denial of the unconditional efficacy of baptism in the case of all infant recipients." (pp. 11, 12.)

"After the arguments on both sides were ended before the Judicial Committee, we were all enabled calmly to consider what the result of the whole had been. For myself, I felt, with anxiety and disappointment, that the growing impressions and doubts of the preceding six or eight months had been strengthened rather than relieved." (pp. 12, 13.)

* In the Popish rebellion of 1549. Your Lordship will recollect that their forces were routed at Exeter by Lord Russell.

† I quote from—"A Second Letter on the Present Position of the High Church party in the Church of England. By the Rev. William Maskell, Vicar of S. Mary Church." (Pickering.)

"When Mr. Gorham was refused institution, more than two years ago, I thought that it was almost impossible for him to raise a reasonable question as to the exact teaching of the English church upon baptismal regeneration; a question, that is, such as a court would entertain. But time went on, and the real state of things and tone of doctrine which prevailed for fifty or sixty years after the reign of Henry the Eighth, during which the first movers of the changes in religion or their immediate disciples still lived, opened, and became clearer from day to day.

"It would be dishonest to attempt to exaggerate or put an untrue face upon the real state of the matter." (p. 13.)

"I was not prepared to learn, as I have learnt, that perhaps without two exceptions, all the divines, bishops and archbishops, doctors and professors, of the Elizabethan age—the age, be it remembered, of the present common prayer book in its chief particulars, and of the book of homilies, and of the 39 articles—held and taught doctrines inconsistent (I write advisedly) with the true doctrine of baptism.

"There are two causes to which such a misapprehension of fact, so far as regards myself, may perhaps be traced; and others must decide whether these or some similar reasons will serve to account for their own previous opinions about the orthodoxy of theologians of the Elizabethan age.

"First: we have been accustomed both to read and to refer to their books, under the impression of long-established prejudices: under the impression that they *must* have been sound divines, because they were the chief leaders and earliest children of the Reformation; and because they had arguments, plenty and specious enough, against some of the doctrines and discipline of the church of Rome.

"Secondly: we have known their writings, chiefly by means of catenæ; a means very likely indeed to lead to false conclusions, because whilst it professes to give fairly the judgment of those appealed to in the matter under dispute, it often does not, and in some cases cannot, in reality do anything of the kind. There are more doctrines than one—for example, this doctrine of holy baptism—upon which writers may make very strong and catholic statements in one book, or in one part of a book, which are all explained away, or in various degrees qualified, or even, in truth, contradicted, by different statements in the same or in other books. Catenæ are useful enough, within their proper and reasonable limits; they create difficulties sometimes, whilst they will very seldom suffice to establish a conclusion: employed, however, as they have been, of late years,

by our own party, they are not merely a packed jury, but a jury permitted to speak only half their mind. In short, the value of catenæ can be only justly estimated, where there is also a living Church, ever prepared to speak with an infallible voice.

"Nor is it to be forgotten that whilst many extracts from the Elizabethan books were produced, explaining in a sense inconsistent with Catholic truth, the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, on the other hand there were no passages to be found, distinctly asserting that the reformed church of England holds exclusively the sacramental efficacy of baptism in the case of all infant recipients. It is one thing for a religious community to allow its ministers to hold and to teach a particular doctrine; it is quite another that they should be enjoined to teach it, as being certainly and exclusively true. There are some parts of the books of the Elizabethan writers, which are examples of the first of these positions, namely, the permission; but I do not remember any example of the second: on the contrary, numberless proofs that it could scarcely have been intended. It may rather be a question whether, in the days of Queen Elizabeth, a clergyman would not have been liable to censure who, not content with being suffered to teach what he himself believed with regard to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, should have gone on further to declare that the church of England still pronounced those to be unsound and heretical, who did not acknowledge the unconditional efficacy of infant baptism. Or, to put it in other words, if such an one had further declared that the teaching of the church of Rome and of the reformed church of England, upon the sacrament of baptism, was necessarily to be understood and accepted, by all English clergy, as identical and the same.

"I must own, therefore, that the additional argument produced by Mr. Gorham's advocate in his speech before the committee, based upon a comparison between the articles of 1536, and the articles of 1552 and 1562, seemed to me to be forcible and correct. It supplied a cause of one effect of the alteration of the documents and formularies of the English church, which was so visibly and frequently to be observed, in the language used by men, contemporaries or nearly so, respecting the sacrament of holy baptism. And I cannot dispute the principle involved in the following sentence of the judgment delivered by the judicial committee; they say: '—it appears that opinions, which we cannot in any important particular distinguish from those entertained by Mr. Gorham, have been propounded and maintained, without censure or reproach, by many eminent and illustrious prelates and divines who have adorned the church from the time when the

[42 and 39] articles were first established. We do not affirm that the doctrines and opinions of Jewell, Hooker, Usher, Jeremy Taylor, Whitgift, Pearson, Carlton, Prideaux, and many others, can be received as evidence of the doctrine of the church of England; but their conduct, unblamed and unquestioned as it was, proves, at least, the liberty which has been allowed in maintaining such doctrine.' " (pp. 15—20.)

"There is another point to which I had intended to direct your attention; namely, to the contradictions which appear to exist between the course of teaching which many of our party commonly adopt and the thirty-nine articles, together with an enquiry into the kind of interpretation, and its admissibility, by which such apparent contradictions are avoided. It is, of course, in itself a relief openly to state our mode of interpretation, and to leave to our rulers to decide by legal proceedings, whether it is, or is not, within the limits of our subscription. But I shall now pass this by." (pp. 46, 47.)

"As to the second of the two classes, namely, the low-church or evangelical, I have no hesitation in making a candid avowal. Whatever my opinions may have been some time ago, it is impossible for me to conceal from myself that further enquiry has convinced me, that the real spirit and intention of the reformed church of England are shewn and carried out and taught by the low-church party, as truly as by ourselves: I cannot bring myself to say, 'rather than ourselves:' but that at least they have amply sufficient argument to oblige us to the acknowledgment, that the very utmost which we can claim for our opinions is, that they are 'open' to us." (p. 56.)

"But, by way of illustration, take one or two examples. And these will perhaps show how certain passages which are difficulties, and we feel them to be such, in our own path, are, in the first and plainest sense of the words, in favour of the evangelical system: and not only so, but we have nothing so plain to produce against them. In short, these are passages which *we* 'get out of' or explain away, whilst *they* take them in their simple and obvious meaning. In these one or two examples you will observe that I refer to the prayer-book as well as the articles." (p. 58.)

The examples referred to are,—Justification, Absolution, The Holy Eucharist, &c.

"Connected with this, there is another consideration which, for some time, has pressed heavily and painfully upon me. As a fact, the evangelical party plainly, openly, and fully, declare their opinions upon the doctrines which they contend the church of England holds: they tell their people continually, what they ought, as a matter of

duty towards God and towards themselves, both to believe aud practise. Can it be pretended that we, as a party, anxious to teach the truth, are equally open, plain, and unreserved? If we are not so, is prudence, or economy, or the desire to lead people gently and without rashly disturbing them, or any other like reason, a sufficient ground for our withholding large portions of catholic truth? Can any one chief doctrine or duty be reserved by us, without blame or suspicion of dishonesty? And it is not to be alleged, that only the less important duties and doctrines are so reserved: as if it would be an easy thing to distinguish and draw a line of division between them. Besides, that which we are disputing about cannot be trivial and unimportant; if it were so, we rather ought, in christian charity, to acknowledge our agreement in essentials, and consent to give up the rest.

"But we do reserve vital and essential truths; we often hesitate and fear to teach our people many duties, not all necessary, perhaps, in every case or to every person, but eminently practical, and sure to increase the growth of the inner, spiritual life; we differ, in short, as widely from the evangelical party in the manner and openness, as in the matter and details, of our doctrine." (pp. 65, 66.)

"Let me, in this place, sum up briefly what has been said in the two Letters which I have written to you."———

"3. That the judgment of the Judicial committee in that cause is probably a correct and true judgment; and, if it be so, that the reformed church of England did not, and at the present time does not, exclusively require her clergy to teach, and her people to believe, the unconditional efficacy of baptism in the case of all infants."———

"6. That the evangelical clergy, as a party, no less than the Anglican or high-church party, represent and carry out the spirit and the system of the English reformation, as declared by contemporary authorities, and sanctioned by the existing formularies." (p. 74.)

My Lord, this is no ordinary testimony. These are the words of one who was, heart and soul, with you; who would fain have been so still; who has been reluctantly compelled to yield an unwilling assent to overpowering evidence; and now frankly, honourably, nobly admits the change, avows his convictions, and hastens to do justice to those whom (I will not say he had reproached with words of contumely and abuse, because this was not even then his habit, but whom) he had formerly believed to be mistaken in supposing their doctrine to be consistent with the Articles and Formularies of our Church. Of such a man,—

widely as we now seem to be separated in our views of Christian doctrine,—I will at least say, *Cum talis sis, utinam noster esses!*

Permit me, then, my Lord, to call your attention to the evidence which such testimony affords, that you are seeking to defend a position that is wholly untenable; that you are branding and persecuting, as men opposed to the tenets of the Church in which they are ministering, those who are (to say the least) equally attached and faithful adherents to its real doctrines with yourself.

Mr. Maskell's words, my Lord, will sink deep into many hearts. They are the words of truth and soberness; of calm reflection and impartial scrutiny. They will bear investigation, and be a permanent witness to the truth. Words of angry calumny and passionate reproach and fervent indignation—eloquent invectives and protests—may be listened to for a moment, as the attention is arrested by the thunders of the storm or the shrill cries of the hurricane. But they will pass away as a cloud, and leave nothing behind them but the recollection of noise, confusion, and mischief. The still small voice of truth will pass into the soul, will produce a lasting impression, will determine the views and influence the conduct of men.

Such testimony from such a witness leaves your cause hopelessly prostrate.

Nor will it be found, I suspect, ultimately, that the doctrine which your Lordship is so desirous of inculcating and enforcing upon the Church, has gained any additional strength by your advocacy, still less by the means you have made use of to promote it. If you sought the excitement and the perils of contention for the *shibboleth* of a party, you have had full scope for their enjoyment. If your desire was to make yourself a gazing-stock, you have had a triumph. If you wished for a name as imperishable as that of Erostratus, and for a like reason, you have attained your object. But with this success you must remain content. The triumphs of reason, the conquests of the Faith, are gained in a very different way, and with far other weapons.

My Lord, there is yet one more testimony which I must be permitted to bring under your notice before I conclude this

Letter. And that shall be an extract from the Charge of a Bishop of our Church, not many years since, to the Clergy of his Diocese. The spirit which it breathes is one which, under present circumstances, it is indeed as "refreshing" to contemplate, as "the noble statements of Catholic truth" you have given us from Hooker. Your Lordship will not, I hope, be too much offended with the liberal tone displayed in it towards the *Independent* and *Wesleyan* Dissenters, and the admission it contains of their agreement with us in all essential points of doctrine, to listen to it with patience. When I tell you the name of the author, I am sure you will feel that it deserves attention. I quote the passage without abridgment, precisely as it stands in the Charge, forming its concluding remarks.

"Of Dissenters of some other denominations, especially of *Independents*, there is a larger number; but these, I rejoice to think, are commonly of a much more Evangelical description. In one signal instance, where an Independent Minister, and almost the whole of his large congregation, have returned to the bosom of the Church, it appeared on inquiry, (and I felt it my duty to make *very close inquiry*) that *their doctrines* and worship were, before their reunion with us, *sound and irreproachable*. I have heard the same of some other instances, into which I have had an opportunity of inquiring; and I hope, therefore, *that the same might be affirmed of many of the rest*. But the great mass of Dissenters amongst us (especially in the Western part of the Diocese) are *Methodists*, and of these the far greater proportion are *Wesleyans*, a class of Christians whom I grieve to call *Separatists*—for *Separatists*, I am bound to say, is but another word for *Schismatics*—however those to whom it applies may think of it, and however we may, and ought in charity to hope, that the guilt of wilful schism belongs but to few of them. Be this as it may, *Dissenters they scarcely are. They agree with us almost entirely in doctrine*—CERTAINLY IN ALL WHICH THE MOST RIGIDLY ORTHODOX AMONG US WOULD DEEM ESSENTIAL PARTS OF THE CHRISTIAN COVENANT; AND THEY DIFFER FROM US IN NO DOCTRINE WHICH THE ARTICLES OF OUR CHURCH CONDEMN. *Would to God that* THE NARROW PARTITION, *which divides them from us, could be broken down!*—that now, when the impugners of our common faith, the enemies of our common Zion, are assailing us (aye, and not only us, but Christianity itself) with a bitterness and rancour unknown in other times, and are unhappily animated in their unhallowed warfare by hopes which they never before dared to breathe—no, nor to enter-

tain—within this Christian land—*would to God that now all, who look for salvation solely to the cross of our Divine Redeemer, would unite in one holy bond of fellowship, and be on earth as we trust they will be in Heaven, 'one fold under one Shepherd, Jesus Christ our Lord!'* Our separated brethren of every denomination (*and all, be it remembered, are our brethren in Christ, who hold what is essential in the Christian covenant,*)—our separated brethren may be assured, that no idle punctilio would be allowed by us to stand in the way of that blessed result—that no vain scruple would be insisted on—nothing which *they* themselves would not see to be a grave, even if they could not admit it to be a sound, objection. IN TRUTH, THEY KNOW ALREADY THAT THE WALL OF PARTITION, AS IT WAS NOT BUILT, SO NEITHER IS IT UPHELD BY US. They know, aye, and they acknowledge, that the Church imposes no terms of communion which they themselves will dare to call sinful. The more, therefore, doth it behove them (I say it not to reproach, but earnestly and affectionately to admonish them) to ponder well the reasons which keep them separate,—to be sure that those reasons are such as will justify the separation, not to their own judgment only, but also at the judgment-seat of Him, who is 'not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all the churches of the saints.' Meanwhile, let us, on both sides, remember that it is not for *us* to judge; if we are to be separated in worship, let us not be separated in feeling and in affection. Let each be ready to say to the other, '*For our brethren and companions' sake we will wish thee prosperity; yea, because of the House of the Lord our God, we will seek to do thee good.*' While the world, and the men of the world, are troubled and troubling on every side, while they seek to involve both our Church and us in the common ruin of all that is venerable and holy—it is our great consolation that, against our Church, as a sound branch of the Catholic Church of Christ, while it continues such, 'the gates of hell,' 'the powers of darkness,' cannot prevail. 'He that sitteth in the Heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision!' And even as respects ourselves, we will not forget, that, be they as successful against us as they may, their success (unless by our own fault) will and must be brief—that 'our redemption draweth nigh.' MAY THAT HOUR (COME, WHEN IT WILL, TO EVERY ONE AMONG US) MAY IT FIND US AT PEACE IN OUR OWN MINDS, AND SEEKING PEACE WITH OTHERS! ABOVE ALL, AT PEACE WITH HIM, WHOSE CHOSEN TITLE, GIVEN TO HIM BY HIS OWN INSPIRED AND EVANGELICAL PROPHET, TELLS US 'WHAT SPIRIT WE ARE OF,' WHOM, AS DEAR CHILDREN, WE ARE BOUND TO FOLLOW, 'THE PRINCE OF PEACE.' God grant this to you, to me, and all his whole Church, through Jesus Christ our Lord!"

Thus spoke Dr. Henry Phillpotts, Bishop of Exeter, at his Primary Visitation in 1833. My Lord, the Catholic spirit which that passage breathes, the solemn words that form its conclusion—alas! what a contrast do they present to the sounds that are now escaping from the same lips! Talk you of change, my Lord, in our venerated Primate? of the teaching of his later, contradicting the sounder teaching of his earlier, years? Alas! what a change is here! Could the prophetic spirit that forewarned Hazael of his future acts, have whispered in your ear the circumstances in which the close of your course would find you, how would the same indignant exclamation have betrayed the horror-stricken incredulity with which you received the startling premonition!

Reflect, my Lord! Is truth changed? Are the "essential parts of the Christian Covenant" different now from what they were when you wrote thus? Are "the impugners of our common faith, the enemies of our common Zion, assailing us" with less "bitterness and rancour" than they then were? Is union among "all who look for salvation solely to the cross of our Divine Redeemer," less needful, less a duty, than it was seventeen years ago? Does the "Prince of Peace" warn us to speak less peacefully now to any such—to build up new "walls of partition"—to cast out of the fold, as *heretics*, the followers of the "illustrious" Usher, the Apostolic Bedell, the incomparable Leighton?

Think again, my Lord; and ponder the concluding words of your own solemn admonitions. The lapse of seventeen years has surely not rendered it less necessary for you to think of that hour for which you have prayed,—"May it find us at peace in our own minds, *and seeking peace with others!* Above all, at peace with Him, whose chosen title given to him by his own inspired and evangelical prophet, tells us '*what spirit we are of,*' whom, as dear children, we are bound to follow, 'the Prince of Peace.'"

I am, My Lord,

Your obedient humble Servant,

W. GOODE.

London, April 18, 1850.

POSTSCRIPT.

YOUR Lordship will not, I suppose, think that your Postscript needs many remarks; still less the Postscript to the Postscript, which appeared, I believe, only in a few Papers of very limited circulation. In the former (which appeared in the "Times" of March 29) you intimate your having discovered, that you were incorrect in stating, that no edition of Bullinger's Decads had appeared here subsequent to the year 1577, a copy of the edition of 1587 having been shown to you, as well as the notice in Watt's Bibliotheca Britannica of this edition, as well as of one in 1584. My remarks on this point were written before that Postscript appeared. And as you still repeat your former objections to His Grace's statement respecting that work, those remarks are as necessary as before the appearance of your Postscript. The other point which you there mention, namely, the statement of your having at one time been willing to institute Mr. Gorham on his promising not to publish an account of the Examination, is one which I do not feel called upon in any way to notice.

In the Postscript to the Postscript, which can hardly be *known* to more than comparatively very few individuals, except perhaps from the later editions of your Letter, your Lordship calmly informs the Public, in a few lines, that you have learned since the publication of your Letter, that your charge against the Archbishop for the "new matter" introduced into the last edition of his work on Apostolical Preaching, is unfounded; for which your apology is, that when you wrote you had access only to "the original edition of 1815, and the one recently set forth;" which appears to me to be little better than that of the *confitentem reum.* I notice in this way the existence of such a Postscript, lest I should give any occasion for cavil by omitting to mention it. But I do not feel called upon to make any remark upon it. The Public will judge of the value of such a reparation for your attack upon the Primate, on evidence, the nature of which you now acknowledge.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY C. F. HODGSON, 1 GOUGH SQUARE, FLEET STREET.